

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, January 3, 1983

This being the day fixed by the 20th amendment of the Constitution of the United States for the annual meeting of the Congress of the United States, the Members-elect of the 98th Congress met in their Hall, and, at 12 o'clock noon, were called to order by the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, Hon. Benjamin J. Guthrie.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Gracious God, we implore Your blessing upon this assembly and upon all for whom the authority of government is given. We pray that Your spirit of reconciliation and peace, of good will and understanding will prevail in our hearts and in our lives. Encourage us, O God, to use our abilities and talents in ways that bring righteousness to this Nation and to all the people. Ever remind us of the needs of the poor, the homeless or forgotten, those who live without freedom or liberty, that we will be instruments of justice for all citizens and ease the hurt of every person. May Your spirit live with us each day and may Your grace surround us and those we love that in all things we may be the people You would have us be and serve this Nation as we ought to serve. In Your name, we pray. Amen.

The SERGEANT AT ARMS. Representatives-elect to the 98th Congress, this being the day fixed by the 20th amendment of the Constitution for the meeting of the 98th Congress, the Clerk of the 97th Congress has prepared the official roll of the Representatives-elect. Pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 26, the Sergeant at Arms of the 97th Congress will make the following announcement:

Certificates of election covering the 435 seats in the 98th Congress have been received by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and the names of those persons whose credentials show that they were regularly elected as Representatives in accordance with the laws of their respective States and of the United States will be called.

Without objection, the Representatives-elect will record their presence by electronic device, and their names will be reported in alphabetical order by States, beginning with the State of Alabama, to determine whether a quorum is present.

There was no objection.

The SERGEANT AT ARMS. The Chair would like to state that any Member-elect who has not received his or her

voting card may do so now in the Speaker's lobby.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Representatives-elect responded to their names:

(Roll No. 1)

ALABAMA			INDIANA		
Bevill	Nichols	Edwards	Hall	Sharp	Hillis
Erdreich	Shelby		Hamilton	Burton	Myers
Filippo	Dickinson		Jacobs	Coats	
			McCloskey	Hiler	
ALASKA			IOWA		
Young			Bedell	Smith	Leach
			Harkin	Evans	Tauke
ARIZONA			KANSAS		
McNulty	McCain	Stump	Glickman	Roberts	Winn
Udall	Rudd		Slattery	Whittaker	
ARKANSAS			KENTUCKY		
Alexander	Bethune		Hubbard	Perkins	Snyder
Anthony	Hammerschmidt		Mazzoli	Hopkins	
			Natcher	Rogers	
CALIFORNIA			LOUISIANA		
Anderson	Lantos	Dannemeyer	Boggs	Long	Livingston
Bates	Lehman	Dreier	Breaux	Roemer	Moore
Beilenson	Levine	Fiedler	Huckaby	Tauzin	
Berman	Martinez	Hunter	MAINE		
Bosco	Matsui	Lagomarsino	Snowe		
Boxer	Miller	Lewis	MARYLAND		
Brown	Mineta	Lowery	Hoyer	Long	Mitchell
Burton	Panetta	Lungren	Byron	Mikulski	Holt
Coelho	Patterson	McCandless	Dyson		
Dellums	Roybal	Moorhead	MASSACHUSETTS		
Dixon	Stark	Packard	Markey	Mavroules	Shannon
Dymally	Torres	Pashayan	Mavroules	Moakley	Studds
Edwards	Waxman	Shumway	O'Neill	Conte	
Fazio	Badham	Thomas	MICHIGAN		
Hawkins	Chappie	Zschau	Ford		Broomfield
COLORADO			Albosta	Hertel	Davis
Kogovsek	Wirth	Kramer	Bonior	Kildee	Pursell
Schroeder	Brown		Carr	Levin	Sawyer
			Conyers	Traxler	Siljander
CONNECTICUT			Crockett	Wolpe	Vander Jagt
Gejdenson	Morrison	Johnson	Dingell		
Kennelly	Ratchford	McKinney	MINNESOTA		
DELAWARE			Oberstar	Sikorski	Stangeland
Carper			Penny	Vento	Weber
			Sabo	Frenzel	
FLORIDA			MISSISSIPPI		
Bennett	Lehman	Lewis	Dowdy	Whitten	Lott
Chappell	MacKay	Mack	Montgomery	Franklin	
Fascell	Mica	McCollum			
Fuqua	Nelson	Shaw	MISSOURI		
Gibbons	Pepper	Young	Clay	Volkmer	Coleman
Hutto	Smith		Gephardt	Wheat	Emerson
Ireland	Bilirakis		Skelton	Young	Taylor
GEORGIA			MONTANA		
Barnard	Levitass	Thomas	Williams	Marlenee	
Fowler	McDonald	Gingrich			
Hatcher	Ray		NEBRASKA		
Jenkins	Rowland		Bereuter	Daub	Smith
HAWAII					
Akaka	Heftel		Reid	Vucanovich	
IDAHO			NEVADA		
Craig	Hansen		D'Amours		
ILLINOIS			NEW HAMPSHIRE		
Annunzio	Savage	Hyde	Gregg		
Collins	Simon	Madigan	NEW JERSEY		
Durbin	Washington	Martin	Minish	Rodino	Forsythe
Evans	Yates	Michel	Roe	Roukema	Rinaldo
Lipinski	Corcoran	O'Brien	Torricelli	Smith	
Price	Crane, Daniel	Porter	Courter		
Rostenkowski	Crane, Philip		NEW MEXICO		
Russo	Erlenborn		Lujan	Skeen	

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Boldface type indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

NEW YORK

Adabbo	Rangel	Gilman
Blagel	Rosenthal	Green
Dowsey	Schumer	Horton
Forsano	Schumer	Kemp
Garcia	Solow	Lent
LaFalce	Stratton	Martin
Lundine	Towens	McCreath
McHugh	Weiss	Molinaro
Meehan	Buellert	Solomon
Nowak	Carmy	Wortley
Ottenger	Conable	
Owens	Fish	

NORTH CAROLINA

Andrews	Jones	Whitley
Batt	Neal	Brothill
Clarke	Rose	Martin
Hefner	Valentine	

NORTH DAKOTA

Dorgan

OHIO

Applegate	Pease	Latta
Baker	Seiberling	McEwen
Brigman	Stokes	Miller
Hall	DeWine	Ooley
Kaplan	Gardner	Regula
Luker	Kasich	Williams
Oskar	Kinross	Wylie

OKLAHOMA

English	McCleary	Watkins
Jones	Senar	Edwards

OREGON

AuCoin	Wicklen	Smith, Robert
Weaver	Smith, Denny	

PENNSYLVANIA

Borski	Kostmayer	Goodling
Coyne	Murphy	McDate
Etlinger	Murtha	Ritter
Foglietta	Walgren	Schulze
Goydos	Yatron	Shuster
Gray	Clinger	Walker
Harrison	Coughlin	
Kotler	Gekas	

RHODE ISLAND

St Germain, Schneider

SOUTH CAROLINA

Davitt	Tallon	Mathett
Specht	Campbell	Spence

SOUTH DAKOTA

Daschle

TENNESSEE

Baker	Ford	Duncan
Bourquard	Gore	Quillen
Cooper	Jones	Sundquist

TEXAS

Andrews	Kell, Sam	Stenholm
Brooks	Marce	Vandegriff
Bryant	McClintock	Wilson
Coleman	Kasam	Wright
de la Garza	Leath	Archer
Frost	Leland	Bartlett
Gonzalez	Ortiz	Fields
Gramm	Pitman	Loeffler
Kell, Ralph	Pinkle	Paul

UTAH

Hansen, Marriott, Nielson

VERMONT

Jeffords

VIRGINIA

Boucher	Stedman	Whitthurst
Daniel	Billy	Wolf
Oliver	Parris	
Siskiy	Robinson	

WASHINGTON

Bonker	Leahy	Morrison
Dicks	Swift	Pritchard
Foley	Chandler	

WEST VIRGINIA

Molbhan	Staggers
Rahall	Wise

WISCONSIN

Aspin	Okey	Petri
Kastenmeier	Zablocki	Roth
Moody	Gundersen	Sensenbrenner

WYOMING

Cheney

□ 1215

The Sergeant at Arms. The quorum call discloses that 416 Representatives-elect have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE SERGEANT AT ARMS

The Sergeant at Arms. The Sergeant at Arms will state that the credentials are on file showing the election of the Honorable BERNARD CONRAD as Resident Commissioner from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico for a term of 4 years beginning January 3, 1983; the election of the Honorable WALTER E. FAUNOY as Delegate from the District of Columbia; the election of the Honorable ANTONIO BERNARD WONG as Delegate from Guam; the election of the Honorable RON DE LUCA as Delegate from the Virgin Islands; and the election of the Honorable FORD I. F. STONE as Delegate from American Samoa.

The Sergeant at Arms regrets to announce the death of the Honorable JACK SWIGERT on December 27, 1982, a Member-elect from the 6th District of Colorado.

ELECTION OF SPEAKER

The Sergeant at Arms. The next order of business is the election of the Speaker of the House of Representatives for the 98th Congress.

Nominations are now in order.

The Sergeant at Arms recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LONG).

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Sergeant at Arms, as Chairman of the Democratic Caucus, I am directed by the unanimous vote of that caucus to present for election to the office of the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the 98th Congress the name of the Honorable THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., a Representative-elect from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The Sergeant at Arms. The Sergeant at Arms now recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP).

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Sergeant at Arms, as chairman of the Republican Conference and by the authority and direction and unanimous vote of the Republican Conference, I am pleased to nominate for speaker of the House of Representatives the Honorable ROBERT H. MICHAEL, a Representative-elect from the State of Illinois to the 98th Congress.

□ 1230

The Sergeant at Arms. The Honorable THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., a Representative-elect from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and the Honorable ROBERT H. MICHAEL, a Representative-elect from the State of Illinois, have been placed in nomination.

Are there any further nominations?

There being no further nominations, the Sergeant at Arms will appoint tellers.

The Sergeant at Arms appoints the gentleman from California (Mr. HAWKINS), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRANZEN), the gentleman from Colorado (Mrs. SCHROEDER), and the gentleman from Maryland (Mrs. HORN).

The tellers will come forward and take their seats at the desk in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The roll will now be called, and those responding to their names will indicate by surname the nominee of their choice.

The reading clerk will now call the roll.

The tellers having taken their places, the House proceeded to vote for the Office of the Speaker.

□ 1300

The following is the result of the vote:

(Roll No. 2)

O'NEILL—259

Adabbo	Casper	Gramm
Alaska	Coyne	Gray
Alibusta	Chambliss	Guarini
Alexander	Daniel	Hall (IN)
Anderson	Daschle	Hall (OH)
Andrews (NC)	de la Garza	Hill, Ralph
Andrews (TX)	Dellums	Hill, Sam
Armstrong	Derrick	Hamilton
Anthony	Dicks	Hansen
Applegate	Dingell	Harkin
Aspin	Dixon	Harrison
AuCoin	Donnelly	Hatcher
Barnard	Dorgan	Hawkins
Barnes	Dowdy	Hefner
Bates	Dowsey	Hertel
Beall	Durbin	Hightower
Bellemont	Dwyer	Howard
Bennett	Dymally	Hoyer
Berman	Dyson	Hughes
Bevil	Early	Huckaby
Biggs	Edwards (CA)	Hughes
Boiland	Edwards (CA)	Island
Boner	English	Jacobs
Bonior	Erdreich	Jenkins
Bonker	Evans (IL)	Jones (NC)
Borski	Faith	Jones (OK)
Bosse	Feighan	Jones (TN)
Boucher	Ferraro	Kaptur
Bourquard	Flippo	Kastenmeier
Bower	Florio	Kawen
Brown	Foglietta	Kennedy
Britt	Foley	Kildee
Brouss	Ford (OH)	Kruguek
Brown (CA)	Ford (TN)	Kotler
Bryant	Fowler	Kostmayer
Burton (CA)	Frank	LaFalce
Byrum	Frust	Lantos
Casper	Fugua	Leath
Carr	Garcia	Lehman (CA)
Chappell	Goydos	Lehman (FL)
Clarke	Gjeldness	Leland
Cly	Gephart	Levin
Cordis	Gibbons	Levine
Coleman (TX)	Glickman	Levin
Collins	Gonzalez	Lipinski
Congers	Gore	Long (LA)

Long (MD)	Patterson	Stark
Lowry (WA)	Pease	Stenholm
Luken	Penny	Stokes
Lundine	Pepper	Stratton
MacKay	Perkins	Studds
Markey	Pickle	Synar
Martinez	Price	Tallon
Matsui	Rahall	Tauzin
Mavroules	Rangel	Thomas (GA)
Mazzoli	Ratchford	Torres
McCloskey	Ray	Torricelli
McCurdy	Reid	Towns
McHugh	Richardson	Traxler
McNulty	Rodino	Udall
Mica	Roe	Valentine
Mikulski	Roemer	Vandergriff
Miller (CA)	Rose	Vento
Mineta	Rostenkowski	Volkmer
Minish	Rowland	Walgren
Mitchell	Roybal	Washington
Moakley	Sabo	Watkins
Mollohan	Savage	Waxman
Montgomery	Scheuer	Weaver
Moody	Schroeder	Weiss
Morrison (CT)	Schumer	Wheat
Mrazek	Seiberling	Whitley
Murphy	Shannon	Whitten
Murtha	Sharp	Williams (MT)
Natcher	Shelby	Wilson
Neal	Sikorski	Wirth
Nelson	Simon	Wise
Nichols	Sisisky	Wolpe
Nowak	Skelton	Wright
Oakar	Slattery	Wyden
Oberstar	Smith (FL)	Yates
Obey	Smith (IA)	Yatron
Olin	Solarz	Young (MO)
Ortiz	Spratt	Zablocki
Owens	St Germain	
Patman	Staggers	

MICHEL—155

Bartlett	Hansen (UT)	Petri
Bateman	Hartnett	Porter
Bereuter	Hiler	Pritchard
Bethune	Holt	Pursell
Billirakis	Hopkins	Quillen
Billey	Horton	Regula
Boehlert	Hunter	Ridge
Broomfield	Hyde	Rinaldo
Brown (CO)	Jeffords	Ritter
Broyhill	Johnson	Roberts
Burton (IN)	Kasich	Robinson
Campbell	Kemp	Rogers
Carney	Kindness	Roth
Chandler	Kramer	Roukema
Chappie	Lagomarsino	Rudd
Cheney	Latta	Sawyer
Coleman (MO)	Lent	Schneider
Conable	Lewis (CA)	Schulze
Conte	Lewis (FL)	Sensenbrenner
Corcoran	Livingston	Shaw
Coughlin	Loeffler	Shumway
Courter	Lott	Shuster
Craig	Lowery (CA)	Siljander
Crane, Daniel	Lujan	Skeen
Crane, Philip	Lungren	Smith (NE)
Dannemeyer	Mack	Smith (NJ)
Daub	Madigan	Smith, Denny
Davis	Marlenee	Smith, Robert
DeWine	Marriott	Snowe
Dickinson	Martin (IL)	Snyder
Dreier	Martin (NY)	Solomon
Duncan	McCain	Spence
Edwards (AL)	McCandless	Stangeland
Emerson	McCollum	Stump
Erlenborn	McDade	Sundquist
Evans (IA)	McEwen	Tauke
Fiedler	McGrath	Taylor
Fields	McKernan	Vander Jagt
Fish	McKinney	Vucanovich
Forsythe	Miller (OH)	Walker
Franklin	Molinar	Weber
Frenzel	Moore	Whitehurst
Gekas	Moorhead	Whittaker
Gilman	Morrison (WA)	Williams (OH)
Gingrich	Myers	Winn
Goodling	Nielson	Wolf
Gradison	O'Brien	Wortley
Green	Oxley	Wylie
Gregg	Packard	Young (AK)
Gunderson	Parris	Young (FL)
Hammerschmidt	Pashayan	Zschau
Hansen (ID)	Paul	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Michel O'Neill

NOT VOTING—2

McDonald Swift

The SERGEANT AT ARMS. The tellers agree in their tallies that the total number of votes cast is 417, of which the Honorable THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., of Massachusetts, has received 260, and the Honorable ROBERT H. MICHEL, of Illinois, has received 155, with 2 voting "present."

Therefore, the Honorable THOMAS P. O'NEILL JR., of Massachusetts, is duly elected Speaker of the House of Representatives for the 98th Congress, having received a majority of the votes cast.

The Sergeant at Arms appoints the following committee to escort the Speaker-elect to the chair: The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT), the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT), the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND), and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

The committee will retire from the Chamber to escort the Speaker-elect to the chair.

□ 1310

The Doorkeeper announced the Speaker-elect of the House of Representatives of the 98th Congress, who was escorted to the chair by the committee of escort.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues and guests of the House, it has been customary since the turn of the century for the Speaker-elect to be formally presented to the House by his adversary in the contest. I was just watching the proceedings on the monitor with the Speaker, and would you believe it, in our friendly conversation we actually lost track of the count.

Before exercising the privilege, that is mine Mr. Speaker, I should like to proceed for only a few moments to make several brief acknowledgments and observations. First, I should like to thank my constituents for reelecting me to this House, even if it was by the narrowest of margins.

Second, I should like to profess my profound appreciation to my Republican colleagues for according me this privilege to lead them once again in the 98th Congress.

Two years ago, Mr. Speaker, I stood here and looked out over this House, quite differently constituted, and said that I particularly liked the sight of 52 new Republican freshmen. Let me assure our 24 new Republican Members that, though you are fewer in number than the class of 1980, you have the same wonderful effect on me. Needless to say, if there were 100 of you I would love you all that much more.

Let me also add my welcome to the 57 new Democratic Members. I hope you will come to appreciate what it is to be members of the majority party. Would you believe it, I am one of the two most senior Republican Members on our side of the aisle now, and after 26 years I am still a member of the minority party. [Applause.]

That is always one way of getting an applause from the Democratic side of the aisle.

Well, my colleagues, we have a full-time agenda before us the next 2 years. We are here with many new colleagues and fresh directions from the people who elected us. What we do over the course of the next 2 years will surely be the focus of national and international attention; what we have ahead of us will test our will, our courage, and our abilities, but of equal importance to what we do is how we do it.

We can conduct the Nation's business as statesmen, looking to the future of our country, or we can conduct our business as partisan politicians looking to our own future survival in an election 2 years hence. There is a place for partisanship in this House. It is fundamental to our system of Government. Make no mistake about it, when it comes to the basic principles in which each of our respective parties believe, there will be partisan words and partisan actions, just as there was from both sides in the last Congress.

But, there is a greater place and a greater need for bipartisan cooperation and compromise. We cannot overcome the national problems we face or meet the needs we have without working together and compromising from time to time.

We Republican Members in that spirit of compromise extend to you, Mr. Speaker, this olive branch in the fervent hope that it will be accepted, nurtured, and allowed to symbolize this new Congress.

We have entrusted to us great responsibilities. We have much to do. The people expect much from us; maybe far more than we could ever deliver under ideal circumstances. But, we on our side are ready to roll up our sleeves and go to work. We are ready to work together with you, Mr. Speaker, and those whom you lead.

It is my hope and prayer for this Congress that we have the courage to seek the truth and the humility to realize that we do not have all the answers. Let us use the rules of the House to do the will of the people, and not thwart that will. I might add here that an important part of the will of the people is expressed in protection of the rights of the minority party, no matter which great party happens to bear that title in any particular time in our history.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, although I do not own a computer, I can add well enough to know that I was going to be short again this time, but I am hoping to make it up on the first tee of the very first golf game that we have this year.

I am happy to congratulate you, then Mr. Speaker, and deem it a very high privilege and honor for this Member from Illinois to present to the House the Speaker-elect of the 98th Congress, from the great State of Massachusetts, the Honorable THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

□ 1320

Mr. O'NEILL. My colleagues, let me say that during my years as Speaker I truly have worked with two beautiful and great individuals, outstanding Americans both of them—John Rhodes, who left the Congress this year; and BOB MICHEL, who has been the Republican leader for the past 2 years and is the Republican leader again.

Upon being elected Speaker, I am able to repeat almost in full the speech that the gentleman before me just made. Bob has been here for 26 years, I have been here for 30. In my first 2 years as a Member of Congress I was in the minority, and Bob, I agree with you, it is hell, there is no question about it. Never again would I want to be in the minority.

Fellow Members, their families, friends, and guests, I am deeply honored to be elected for the fourth time as Speaker of this House. I especially want to thank my wife, Millie, and my family. Millie, these 42 years have been years that have gone by awfully quick, and I want you to know you are looking more beautiful to me today than ever. [Applause, the Members rising.]

A fellow in public life is lucky to have a family that trusts and believes in him and goes along with him.

Last November my constituents in the Eighth District of Massachusetts chose me to represent them in Congress for the 16th time. For this latest choice and all the previous choices, I say to the people back home that I am grateful.

Being elected Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives is a high honor that carries with it solemn responsibilities because this is the greatest legislative body in the greatest democracy in the world. Today I pledge to you that I will wield this gavel fairly, firmly, faithfully, and responsibly.

I am ever mindful that the role of the Speaker is to expedite the business of this House. In doing so, I shall respect and follow the established principles, procedures, and precedents. This is my duty under the Constitution and the rules of this body.

The two Houses of the 98th Congress are controlled by rival parties. This is the fourth Congress in the 20th century where this has occurred. In the past this partisan division has set the stage for legislative and political stalemate, but it did not occur in the 97th Congress. The new President's program was given swift and fair consideration. I will do everything I can to prevent a stalemate from happening to this, the 98th Congress. The American people want action, not partisan bickering. Therefore, I am confident that the Members of this House will get to work putting America back to work.

As this Congress convenes, there are 4 million more Americans out of work than there were 2 years ago when the last Congress convened. There are more people out of work in the United States than there are at work in all of Canada. The time for waiting for jobs has passed. The time for action is now at hand. The Federal Government must not bide its time waiting for an economic recovery. It must take those steps necessary to insure a strong recovery. Any recovery that fails to significantly reduce unemployment is unacceptable. The only recovery is one that puts millions of unemployed Americans back to work.

Franklin Roosevelt noted that "economic laws are not made by nature, they are made by human beings." Well, it is about time that we in this House began making some laws to get this country out of the terrible recession we are in. It is time to bring the interest rates down for the average American and to keep them down. It is time to stop waiting for an economic theory to work and, instead, do what we have done before, stimulate the economy.

Naturally, any measure we pass will have to pass the Senate and will have to be signed by the President. Of course, we have our differences, but we have in the past cooperated in the best interests of this Nation. Most recently we cooperated on the highway bill. Before that we worked together to pass the 1982 Tax Equity Act. I hope this cooperation will be repeated during the consideration of the vital social security legislation that will be reported without delay, I trust, by the Committee on Ways and Means. This will be difficult legislation, but no legislation in 1983 is more necessary than that social security bill.

Twenty years ago President Kennedy observed that an unbalanced economy does not produce balanced budgets. Well, that was never more true than today. The projections for a balanced budget in 1984 have turned into a projection of staggering deficits. As unemployment has soared, so have deficits. For the month of October last year, the deficit for that month nearly equaled the deficit for the entire year

of 1979. These huge deficits not only threaten to choke off a recovery but also threaten to tie this Congress up in knots. We cannot afford to let this happen.

We will have to make some tough decisions. We need to make these decisions with the help of realistic economic assumptions. Hard decisions will follow hard numbers. Whatever those budget decisions may be, we need to make them and move on to the business of Congress and the business of the Nation.

Barring a national emergency, last month's postelection session is the last one that I will ever agree to. During the Constitutional Convention the Founding Fathers referred to the House of Representatives as "the First Branch." They did so because it was the branch closest to the people. Elections were scheduled every 2 years, and every seat was up. Unlike the President or the Vice President of the Senate, the only way in which one can serve in this body, in this great House, is to be elected by the people, running every 2 years. Certainly that is a burden, but it is a burden of democracy.

Despite the fact that the Speaker is the same, the House is different than the last one was. Twenty percent of the Members are freshmen. As for the rest of us, the election has brought us closer to our constituents, and that is what the Founding Fathers had intended.

The new Members will find out as they go along that the Speaker has a few prerogatives. He has the power of scheduling and of recognition, he has the power of naming Members to special and select committees, and he has the right to put the numbers on the resolutions. House Joint Resolution 1 this year will be ERA, the equal rights amendment.

□ 1330

As Members of Congress, we may belong to different political parties but there is one thing that we do have in common. That is a love for this Nation, this great Republic and its people.

I hope that what we accomplish here over the next 2 years will result in the Nation developing a greater sense of respect and appreciation for this House and the Government it is a part of. This is certainly a worthy standard to set for this Congress.

To all of my colleagues on my side of the aisle who have given me their trust for the past 6 years, again I say thank you from the bottom of my grateful heart.

Thank you.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

Mr. O'NEILL. I ask that the dean of the House, the Honorable JAMIE L.

WHITTEN of Mississippi, administer the oath of office.

Mr. WHITTEN then administered the oath of office to Mr. O'NEILL, of Massachusetts.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

The SPEAKER. According to the precedent, the Chair will swear in all Members of the House at this time.

If the Members will rise, the Chair will now administer the oath of office.

The Members-elect and Delegates-elect and the Resident Commissioner-elect rose, and the Speaker administered the oath of office to them.

The SPEAKER. The gentlemen and gentlewomen are now Members of the Congress of the United States.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LONG).

MAJORITY LEADER

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Democratic Caucus, I have been directed to report, and of course it is my distinct pleasure to report to the House that the Democratic Members have selected as majority leader the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable JIM WRIGHT.

The SPEAKER. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP).

MINORITY LEADER

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Republican Conference, I am directed by that conference to officially notify the House that the gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable ROBERT H. MICHEL, has been selected by the Republican Members of the House as the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

MAJORITY WHIP

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor and the distinct pleasure to advise the Members of the House that the gentleman from Washington, Mr. FOLEY, will act as whip of the Democratic Party for the 98th Congress.

MINORITY WHIP

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Republican Conference, I am directed by the conference to notify the House officially that the Republican Members have selected as our minority whip the gentleman from

Mississippi, the Honorable TRENT LOTT.

ELECTION OF CLERK OF THE HOUSE, SERGEANT AT ARMS, DOORKEEPER, POSTMASTER, AND CHAPLAIN

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 1) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1

Resolved, That Benjamin J. Guthrie, of the Commonwealth of Virginia, be, and he is hereby, chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives;

That Jack Russ, of the State of Maryland, be, and he is hereby, chosen Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives;

That James T. Molloy, of the State of New York, be, and he is hereby, chosen Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives;

That Robert V. Rota, of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, chosen Postmaster of the House of Representatives; and

That Reverend James David Ford, of the Commonwealth of Virginia, be, and he is hereby, chosen Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I offer a substitute for the resolution just offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), but before offering that substitute, I request that there be a division of the question on the resolution so that we may have a separate vote on the Office of the Chaplain.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the portion of the resolution providing for the election of the Chaplain.

That portion of the resolution was agreed to.

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KEMP

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I offer a substitute amendment for the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read the substitute amendment, as follows:

Resolved, That Hyde H. Murray of the State of Maryland, be, and he is hereby, chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives;

That Walter P. Kennedy, of the State of New Jersey, be, and he is hereby, chosen Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives;

That Tommy Lee Winebrenner, of the State of Indiana, be, and he is hereby, chosen Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives;

That Ronald W. Lasch, of the State of New Jersey, be, and he is hereby, chosen Postmaster of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP).

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on

the resolution offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LONG).

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Will the officers elected present themselves in the well of the House.

The officers-elect presented themselves at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations.

NOTIFICATION TO SENATE OF ORGANIZATION OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 2) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 2

Resolved, That the Senate be informed that a quorum of the House of Representatives has assembled; that THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., a Representative from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, has been elected Speaker; and Benjamin J. Guthrie, a citizen of the Commonwealth of Virginia, has been elected Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Ninety-eighth Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 3) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 3

Resolved, That a committee of three Members be appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled, and that Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to join the committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled, and that Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL), and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. FOLEY).

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO INFORM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF THE ELECTION OF THE SPEAKER AND THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 4) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 4

Resolved, That the Clerk be instructed to inform the President of the United States that the House of Representatives has elected THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., a Representative from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Speaker; and Benjamin J. Guthrie, a citizen of the Commonwealth of Virginia, Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Ninety-eighth Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RULES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 5) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 5

Resolved, That the Rules of the House of Representatives of the Ninety-seventh Congress, including all applicable provisions of law and concurrent resolutions adopted pursuant thereto which constituted the Rules of the House at the end of the Ninety-seventh Congress, be, and they are hereby, adopted as the Rules of the House of Representatives of the Ninety-eighth Congress, with the following amendments included therein as part thereof, to wit:

(1) In rule I, clause 5(b)(1) is amended to read as follows:

"(b)(1) On any legislative day whenever a recorded vote is ordered or the yeas and nays are ordered, or a vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV on any of the following questions, the Speaker may, in his discretion, postpone further proceedings on each such question to a designated time or place in the legislative schedule on that legislative day, in the case of the question of agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, or within two legislative days, in the case of the other questions listed herein:

"(A) the question of passing bills;

"(B) the question of adopting resolutions;

"(C) the question of ordering the previous question on privileged resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules;

"(D) the question of agreeing to conference reports; and

"(E) the question of agreeing to motions to suspend the Rules."

(2) In rule III, insert after clause 5 the following new clause:

"6. He shall supervise the staff and manage any office of a Member who is deceased, has resigned, or been expelled until a successor is elected and shall perform similar duties in the event that a vacancy is declared by the House in any congressional district because of the incapacity of the Member representing such district or other reason. Whenever the Clerk is acting as a supervisory authority over such staff, he shall have authority to terminate employ-

ees; and he may appoint, with the approval of the Committee on House Administration, such staff as is required to operate the office until a successor is elected. He shall maintain on the House payroll and supervise in the same manner staff appointed pursuant to section 800 of Public Law 91-655 (2 U.S.C. 31b-5) for sixty days following the death of a former Speaker."

(3) In rule X, clause 6, insert after paragraph (a) the following new paragraph (b) and redesignate the succeeding paragraphs (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), and (g) as (c), (d), (e), (f), (h), and (i) respectively:

"(b) Membership on standing committees during the course of a Congress shall be contingent on continuing membership in the party caucus or conference that nominated Members for election to such committees. Should a Member cease to be a member of a particular party caucus or conference, said Member shall automatically cease to be a member of a standing committee to which he was elected on the basis of nomination by that caucus or conference. The chairman of the relevant party caucus or conference shall notify the Speaker whenever a Member ceases to be a member of a party caucus or conference and the Speaker shall notify the chairman of each standing committee on which said Member serves, that accord with this rule, the Member's election to such committee is automatically vacated."

In rule X, clause 6(e) as so redesignated, insert before the period at the end thereof the following: "from nominations, submitted by the respective party caucus or conference."

In rule X, clause 6, insert after paragraph (f) as so redesignated the following new paragraph:

"(g) Membership on select and joint committees during the course of a Congress shall be contingent on continuing membership in the party caucus or conference the Member was a member of at the time of his appointment to a select or joint committee. Should a Member cease to be a member of that caucus or conference, said Member shall automatically cease to be a member of any select or joint committee to which he is assigned. The chairman of the relevant party caucus or conference shall notify the Speaker whenever a Member ceases to be a member of a party caucus or conference and the Speaker shall notify the chairman of each select or joint committee on which said Member serves, that in accord with this rule, the Member's appointment to such committee is automatically vacated."

(4) In rule XI, clause 2(g)(2), insert before the period at the end thereof the following: "except that the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the subcommittees therein may, by the same procedure, vote to close up to five additional consecutive days of hearings."

(5) In rule XXI, clause 2 is amended to read as follows:

"2. (a) No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill or shall be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law, except to continue appropriations for public works and objects which are already in progress.

"(b) No provision changing existing law shall be reported in any general appropriation bill except germane provisions which retrench expenditures by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill,

which may include those recommended to the Committee on Appropriations by direction of any legislative committee having jurisdiction over the subject matter thereof.

"(c) No amendment to a general appropriation bill shall be in order if changing existing law. Except as provided in paragraph (d), no amendment shall be in order during consideration of a general appropriation bill proposing a limitation not specifically contained or authorized in existing law for the period of the limitation.

"(d) After a general appropriation bill has been read for amendment and amendments not precluded by paragraphs (a) or (c) of this clause have been considered, motions that the Committee of the Whole rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted shall have precedence over motions to further amend the bill. If any such motion is rejected, amendments proposing limitations not specifically contained or authorized in existing law for the period of the limitation or proposing germane amendments which retrench expenditures by reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill may be considered; but after the vote on any such amendment, the privileged motion made in order under this paragraph may be renewed."

(6) In rule XXI, clause 5, insert "(a)" after "5," and insert at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(b) No bill or joint resolution carrying a tax or tariff measure shall be reported by any committee not having jurisdiction to report tax and tariff measures, nor shall an amendment in the House or proposed by the Senate carrying a tax or tariff measure be in order during the consideration of a bill or joint resolution reported by a committee not having that jurisdiction. A question of order on a tax or tariff measure in any such bill, joint resolution, or amendment thereto may be raised at any time."

(7) In rule XXII, clause 5 is amended to read as follows:

"5. All resolutions of inquiry addressed to the heads of executive departments shall be reported to the House within fourteen legislative days after presentation."

(8) In rule XXIII, clause 1, insert "(a)" after "1," and insert at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(b) After the House has adopted a special order of business resolution reported by the Committee on Rules providing for the consideration of a measure in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, the Speaker may at any time within his discretion, when no question is pending before the House, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of that measure without intervening motion, unless the resolution in question provides otherwise."

(9) In rule XXIV, clause 1, insert after the word "Journal" the phrase "unless postponed pursuant to the provisions of clause 5(b)(1) of rule I".

Mr. WRIGHT (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not object other than to inquire of the dis-

tinguished majority leader if it is his plan to discuss the proposed changes in the rules from the preceding Congress in some detail, and if by practice that amount of discussion time will be limited to the usual hour with a half hour for the minority, in which case I certainly would want to rise in opposition to some of the rules changes and in opposition to the previous question on adoption of those rules.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WRIGHT. The answer to the gentleman's question is yes; it would be my expectation briefly to describe each of the proposed rules changes under the 1-hour limitation after first having yielded for purposes of debate to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) 30 minutes of that hour.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield for purposes of debate only 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois, the distinguished minority leader, Mr. MICHEL, and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed changes in the rules which are brought to you at the direction of the Democratic Caucus are nine in number. Eight of the nine are relatively inconsequential insofar as any major change is concerned. One of those nine is somewhat more consequential.

I should announce at the outset for the benefit of any of those who are unfamiliar with the fact that a 10th change was considered by the Democratic Caucus but on this morning, due to the somewhat controversial nature of the proposed change and the controversy that attended the proposal, the caucus authorized the Democratic leadership to omit that 10th proposal from the package of changes which we bring to the House today. That 10th proposal which was omitted was the one which would have required that two-thirds of the Members should have the requisite signatures on a discharge petition in order to discharge a constitutional amendment from the committee of jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, let me just very briefly enumerate the changes that would be made from the existing rules and then I shall yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) for such debate as he might wish to direct to any or all of them.

□ 1340

The first change that we propose would simply enable the Speaker to postpone a rollcall vote on approving the Journal to a later time on the same legislative day.

The purpose of this, obviously, would be to facilitate the beginning of legislative business without undue delay.

The second proposed change would direct the Clerk of the House to manage the office of a Member when that office becomes vacant due to death, resignation, expulsion, or other declaration of a vacancy by the House, or to appoint and terminate staff to operate the office until his successor is elected.

It also directs the Clerk to continue the staff functions in the event of the death of a former Speaker for 60 days.

The third change we propose merely clarifies the fact which exists today in practice that membership on a committee of the House is contingent on membership in a party caucus or the party conference. In other words, so long as a Member seeks or expects to hold one of those positions reserved for a Democratic majority, that Member should fully expect to be a member in good standing of the Democratic Caucus; so long as a Member expects to hold a seat reserved for the Republican minority, then that Member should indeed expect to be a member in good standing of the Republican conference.

A fourth change would apply only to the Committees on Appropriations, Armed Services, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Present House rules allow all committees, when voting in open session with a quorum present, to close a hearing for purposes of security on that particular day and on 1 additional day only. This fourth proposed change in the rules would extend that time for the Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and their subcommittees to 5 additional days, for a total of not to exceed 6 days, when voting with a quorum present in open session.

Now, we propose a fifth change to the rules, which I expect will attract some debate and some serious consideration. This applies to amendments offered to general appropriations bills.

Very briefly, what we would propose is simply this: that before any amendment in the nature of a limitation to an appropriation bill, other than those provisions reported by the Appropriations Committee, might be considered under the 5-minute rule, the committee first would continue from the beginning to the end of the reading of the bill and the offering of all amendments which relate to sums of money, either to raise or to lower or to add or to delete sums of money to be appro-

priated, that being primarily the fundamental business of an appropriations bill.

□ 1350

Under the proposed rule, after all such amendments have been considered, those relating to dollar amounts, it would be in order for the manager of the bill to move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the whole House with such amendments already adopted.

Now, the manager of the bill is not mandated to do so. If in his or her judgment it seems likely that Members of the House will want to consider legislative language in the nature of limitations, then it would be perfectly discretionary on his or her part to not offer the preferential motion in order to permit the continuance of the debate and the offering of amendments of that type; however, if it appeared likely to the manager of the bill or to such other Member as might be appropriately recognized that the Members did not wish interminably to be harassed or further bothered by the necessity for voting on legislative language coming under the guise of a limitation, then he or she might move that the committee do now rise and report. This would allow the majority of the Members of both sides of the aisle voting to determine whether or not they desired to consider any further limitation amendments to the appropriations bill. If they voted down the motion that the committee should now rise and report the bill back to the whole House, amendments might be offered. After the offering and voting upon of each such amendment, it would be in order again at the option of the manager of the bill or another Member to offer the motion that the committee do now rise and report. Once again, the manager of the bill would be under no obligation to offer any such motion, but might do so as a means of concluding action upon the bill and saving Members from the time-consuming consideration of repetitious amendments.

Now, that is what it does. I suspect that it will be debated at some considerable length and so I will not belabor it further at this point.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that particular point?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes, indeed; I do yield to my friend, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CONABLE. As I understand it then, we are not eliminating the longstanding rule which permits limitations on appropriations bills, but are simply setting up a procedure whereby they can be terminated if they do not originate in the committee.

Now, there is no reason why this has not given, therefore, substantial power

to the committee to control what limitations are put in appropriations bills, irrespective of authorization. In other words, that power is now likely in all probability to be concentrated almost entirely in the Appropriations Committee itself, is it not?

Mr. WRIGHT. Only if a majority of the Members present and voting at the time decide that they want it to be. The gentleman is quite right in declaring that the Appropriations Committee is not inhibited by this rule from doing what it has been able to do in the past and that is to include in the bill at its option limitations of this kind.

Mr. CONABLE. But in the view of the majority leader, does not this substantially then disenfranchise the Members of the House—

Mr. WRIGHT. No; not at all.

Mr. CONABLE. In relation to the powers which are concentrated now in all probability and in all practical effect totally in the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. WRIGHT. No. It does not concentrate them in the Appropriations Committee any more than they now are concentrated and it does not disenfranchise Members of the House except if Members of the House want to drag a majority through an exercise which the majority does not want to be dragged through. Only in those circumstances would it act in the way to disenfranchise a Member.

If the gentleman will permit me, I would like to continue the other rules changes very briefly, because I think most Members will find them relatively noncontroversial.

The sixth change that we propose in the rules would allow a new point of order to be raised at any time against a provision in any bill or Senate amendment which contains a tax or tariff measure, unless that measure was reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, the committee which has proper jurisdiction over those matters.

The seventh proposed rules change would extend from the present period of 7 days to a period of 14 days the time in which a committee would be required to report a proper resolution of inquiry once that resolution had been referred to the committee. It simply gives the committee an additional 7 days.

The eighth proposed change would give to the Speaker the discretionary authority to declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of a particular piece of legislation without a specific vote in the House so to do, but under only limited circumstances. This discretionary power on the part of the Speaker would apply only after the House had adopted a rule under which such a matter would be properly

brought under consideration of the Committee of the Whole. It would simply obviate the need at each juncture for the Whole House to vote, which now is largely a perfunctory matter in any event, to resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House.

Then finally, the ninth and last proposed change would be simply a conforming amendment to accompany the first of the rules changes which I enumerated relating to the postponement of a rollcall vote on approval of the Journal. The proposal would amend the order of business stated in rule XXIV to incorporate the Speaker's power of postponement to a later time in the legislative day.

So there you have it. These are the nine proposed changes which the majority party caucus recommends to the House for incorporation in the rules for the 98th Congress. Aside from these rather modest changes and the one change of some consequence relating to appropriations bills, we would recommend that the rules of the 97th Congress shall be verbatim to the rules of the 98th Congress.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes, of course, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. WYLIE. This is a matter of some consequence, the rider on appropriation bill. So that I may understand it, we now have a rule which permits an amendment which would, simply stated, say that none of the funds appropriated herein may be used for such and such a purpose. As I understand the change which is being proposed here, for example, if say the Appropriations Committee recommended \$10,000, just for an example, for the CIA, an amendment could not be offered which would say that none of the funds appropriated herein can be used for the CIA; but an amendment could be offered which would say that the amount appropriated hereunder can be reduced or shall be reduced from \$10,000 to say \$10.

□ 1400

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman is correct. Or an amendment would be in order simply to strike out the total appropriation. That amendment would be in order because an amendment reducing, raising, substituting, or introducing a new authorized appropriation would be in order as a dollar amount amendment.

Mr. WYLIE. If the gentleman will yield further, I think that is important, Mr. Speaker, to have that explanation with reference to a dollar amount amendment. In other words, what if the amendment offered said, "None of the funds appropriated herein may be used for this same pur-

pose" then, as I understand it, at that point the committee would rise?

Mr. WRIGHT. Well, no, that would be a limitation. If legislative language is employed so as to limit the purposes for which moneys appropriated might be used, so long as those purposes were duly authorized and lawful purposes, then I think that would be regarded as a limitation upon an appropriations bill.

There is nothing, however, in this rule which would prohibit the gentleman from Ohio, let us say, or any other Member, from simply striking the whole amount that is appropriated for the CIA or for any other agency listed in that particular appropriations bill.

Mr. WYLIE. So, the limiting amendment would apply only if the subject is mentioned. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that explanation.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I, of course, yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. I thank my colleague from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the question I would like to ask is: Does the majority party contemplate that in order to present an amendment to an appropriations bill during the 98th Congress in the regular proceeding on the bill, that in order to lay the foundation for doing that, the Committee on Rules, as a part of the rule, for instance, would grant a waiver to this proposed specific change in our rules which requires in effect the presentation of an amendment only at the end of the reading of the bill so that the matter could be deflected by the Committee rising?

Mr. WRIGHT. There is nothing in this rule, if adopted, as I trust and expect that it will be, which would prohibit the Committee on Rules—

Mr. DANNEMEYER. And the majority party?

Mr. WRIGHT. Which would prohibit the Committee on Rules from adopting or from offering to the House, or prohibit the House from adopting a rule which, for example, would enumerate a certain amendment which expressly would be made in order at a given point in the consideration of the bill.

This is done with some frequency by the Committee on Rules and, therefore, occasions, as I am sure the gentleman is fully aware, amendments which otherwise under the rules would not be germane or would not be in order or expressly made in order by the rule which is presented to the House and adopted by the House.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Then, if I may ask the gentleman to yield further, if this rule is adopted we are in the position in the House where the majority party then could, by controlling the

Committee on Rules, put out a rule that could waive this provision to make in order some amendment to an appropriation bill desired by the majority but since we in the minority do not have the votes to modify a rule from the Committee on Rules, the minority would be precluded from making that kind of request, would it not?

Mr. WRIGHT. There would be nothing, there would be no change that I could discern from the present situation or the situation that has existed from time immemorial. When you have the votes, obviously you have a better chance to get your proposition favorably considered. I mean, this is axiomatic.

Now, that is the case presently. If the gentleman has the votes in the Committee on Rules to make in order a certain proposition, then he can do so, and if he does not, he would have to try to do so on the House floor. There would be nothing to prohibit the gentleman from offering an amendment to the rule on the House if, first, he were successful in defeating the previous question on the rule. That does not change, and nothing changes except the presumption that Members must, perforce, be required to vote on and to hear debate upon every limitation which might be dreamed up in the fertile mind of any Member, and offered, the change which we propose to still allow that Member to scheme up whatever limitation he might desire and under the 5-minute rule to move to strike the last word, thus gaining 5 minutes in which to describe what he proposes to do and thus appealing, under that description, to his colleagues to vote down any motion that the Committee should now rise until such time as his preferred amendment might have been considered.

I suspect that that will occur. I think Members on both sides will do that. I would say to the gentleman that there really is not anything partisan about this. I made a study of the number of so-called limitation riders offered by minority and majority Members over the years, and I should think that one party is just about as culpable as the other.

During the 1960's, for example, from 1963 up until 1968 in the administration of Mr. Johnson, 80 percent of the legislative riders were offered by Members of the minority party. However, from 1969 until 1976, during the administration of Presidents Nixon and Ford, 60 percent were offered by Members of the majority party. Then they have varied from the years since that time.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Would my colleague yield further?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair interrupts to advise the gentle-

man from Texas that he has consumed 22 minutes.

Mr. WRIGHT. In that case, Mr. Speaker, with thanks for that timely reminder, I want to withhold the balance of my time until after the minority has consumed such time as it may desire.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL).

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, first may I congratulate the majority on their proposed rules changes, at least the deletion of the one proposed rule requiring two-thirds of the membership to sign a discharge petition for a constitutional amendment. That is at least some progress, and I think that the kind of opposition that the minority has raised over the last several weeks is responsible for your withdrawing that rules change.

Mr. Speaker, I want to read to you the first rule adopted by the First Congress of the United States, M1789.

It said:

The Speaker shall take the chair on every legislative day precisely at the hour to which the House shall have adjourned at the last sitting and immediately call the members to order. On the appearance of a quorum, the Speaker, having examined the Journal of the proceedings . . . shall announce to the House his approval.

Since the adoption of that rule in 1789, until just a few years ago, this House started its legislative day with a quorum present, with the membership on the floor as a body of legislators ready to do business or to do battle.

All of this has changed. Today, we not only do not call the Members to the floor to do what they were sent here to do, we actually discourage them from being here.

Instead, Members are encouraged to stay away, to turn their attention elsewhere while, you, Mr. Speaker, conduct the business of this institution, performing those tasks that were once the hallmark of the legislative process and the responsibility of all of the Members.

This exercise in expediency is being disguised as administrative or managerial reform. It is not that. The rules changes before us, from the approval of the Journal to the riders on appropriations are all aimed at relieving the Members, on both sides of the aisle, of their basic responsibilities as legislators, so that you will have to endure less dissent, less debate, less deliberation, and less legislating.

Mr. Speaker, you are converting this body of Representatives into robots, in a glass-covered dome, who come only when they are called, speak only when they are told, and cast their votes only when it is unavoidable.

It is more than tradition we are discarding. It is the fabric, character, and

personality of an institution that for almost 200 years has stood as a symbol of freedom, open deliberation, and true representative democracy worldwide.

This was once the House of the body politic. It is becoming a House of political bodies who have no purpose other than the service of the master.

The public does not understand the symbolic and practical importance of approving the Journal, no more so than they understand why the messenger from the Senate has to tramp down the center aisle to deliver a message from the other body in this day of modern communication. They probably do not fully comprehend the serious and profound ramifications of prohibiting riders on appropriations. But we do. We know what it means to us, to this institution, and to this Nation.

The new Members among us will soon learn what it all means, when a piece of legislation important to them is enacted without their hearing a word of debate or having the opportunity to debate. They will know when the one chance they have to oversee the spending of public funds or redirect or limit an appropriation is denied to them. They will know when they go back home and try to explain why a U.S. Representative can do nothing about the flow of events in a body that is supposed to represent everyone.

This further concentration of power in the hands of the few is a travesty, and I doubt that it will stop here.

It will continue until all of our rights, all of our responsibilities, all of our prerogatives are gone, wiped away by the hand of authoritarian government.

Unless, of course, the majority in this House works its will here and now. We will find out now what the history, the tradition, the purpose and the politics of this institution mean to the Members. I hope we live up to the dreams and aspirations of our Founding Fathers and all those who served so courageously in this body. I hope we do not disappoint them. But I fear that with what you have started here, we will.

I will include at this point the proposed language of our substitute and a summary of the proposals as well as other pertinent material:

H. RES. 5—AN AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. MICHEL

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the Rules of the House of Representatives of the Ninety-seventh Congress, including all applicable provisions of law and concurrent resolutions adopted pursuant thereto which constituted the Rules of the House at the end of the Ninety-seventh Congress, be, and they are hereby, adopted as the Rules of the House of Representatives of the Ninety-eighth Congress, with the following amendments included therein as part thereof, to wit:

(1) In Rule I, clause 9(b)(1) is amended to read as follows:

"(b)(1) He shall devise and implement a system subject to his direction and control for complete and unedited audio and visual broadcasting and recording of the proceedings of the House of Representatives. Such broadcasting and recording of the proceedings shall include the audio and visual coverage of the Chamber of the House while Members are voting together with such visual presentation of the running vote tally as the Speaker may deem most appropriate and informative. He shall provide for the distribution of such broadcasts and recordings thereof to news media and the storage of audio and video recordings of the proceedings."

(2) In Rule III, insert after clause 5 the following new clause:

"6. He shall supervise the staff and manage any office of a Member who is deceased, has resigned, or been expelled until a successor is elected and shall perform similar duties in the event that a vacancy is declared by the House in any congressional district because of the incapacity of the Member representing such district or other reason. Whenever the Clerk is acting as a supervisory authority over such staff, he shall have authority to terminate employees; and he may appoint, with the approval of the Committee on House Administration, such staff as is required to operate the office until a successor is elected. He shall maintain on the House payroll and supervise in the same manner staff appointed pursuant to section 800 of Public Law 91-655 (2 U.S.C. 31b-5) for sixty days following the death of a former Speaker."

(3)(a) In Rule X, clause 2(c) is amended to read as follows:

"(c)(1) Not later than March 1 in the first session of a Congress each standing committee of the House shall, in a meeting which is open to the public and with a quorum present, adopt and submit to the Committee on Government Operations its oversight plans for that Congress. In developing such plans each committee shall, to the maximum extent feasible—

"(A) consult with other committees of the House which have jurisdiction over the same or related laws, programs, or agencies within its jurisdiction with the objective of assuring that such laws, programs, or agencies are reviewed in the same Congress and that there is maximum coordination and cooperation between such committees in the conduct of such reviews; and such plans shall include an explanation of what steps have been and will be taken to assure such coordination and cooperation;

"(B) give priority consideration to including in its plans the review of those laws, programs, or agencies operating under permanent budget authority or permanent statutory authority; and

"(C) have a view toward insuring that all significant laws, programs, or agencies within its jurisdiction are subject to review at least once every ten years.

"(2) Not later than March 15 in the first session of a Congress, after consultation with the Speaker, the majority leader, and the minority leader, the Committee on Government Operations shall report to the House the oversight plans submitted by each committee together with any recommendations which it, or the House leadership group referred to above, may make to assure the most effective coordination of such plans and otherwise achieve the objectives of this clause."

(b) In Rule X, clause 2 is amended by adding the following new paragraph:

"(e) The Speaker, with the approval of the House, may appoint special ad hoc oversight committees for the purpose of reviewing specific matters with the jurisdiction of two or more standing committees of the House and from the membership of such committees."

(c) In Rule XI, clause 1(d) is amended to read as follows:

"(d)(1) Each committee shall submit to the House, not later than January 2 of each odd-numbered year, a report on the activities of that committee under this rule and Rule X during the Congress ending at noon on January 3 of such year.

"(2) Such report shall include separate sections summarizing the legislative and oversight activities of that committee during that Congress.

"(3) The oversight section of such report shall include a summary of the oversight plans submitted by that committee pursuant to clause 2(c) of Rule X, a summary of the actions taken and recommendations made with respect to each such plan, and a summary of any additional oversight activities undertaken by that committee, and any recommendations made or actions taken thereon."

(4) In Rule X, clause 5(c) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) In carrying out paragraphs (a) and (b) with respect to any matter, the Speaker shall initially refer the matter to one committee which he shall designate as the committee of principal jurisdiction; but he may also refer the matter to one or more additional committees, for consideration in sequence (subject to appropriate time limitations), either on its initial referral or after the matter has been reported by the committee of principal jurisdiction; or refer portions of the matter to one or more additional committees (reflecting different subjects and jurisdictions) for the exclusive consideration of such portion or portions; or refer the matter to a special or ad hoc committee appointed by the Speaker, with the approval of the House, from the members of the committees having legislative jurisdiction, for the specific purpose of considering that matter and reporting to the House thereon; or make such other provision as may be considered appropriate."

(5)(a) In Rule X, clause 6(a)(1) is amended to read as follows:

"(a)(1) The standing committees specified in clause 1 shall be elected by the House at the commencement of each Congress, from nominations submitted by the respective party caucuses, not later than five legislative days after the convening of such Congress."

(b) In Rule XI, clause 1(a) is amended by adding the following new subparagraph:

"(3) Each committee shall hold its organizational meeting not later than eight legislative days after the commencement of a Congress."

(6)(a) In Rule X, clause 6(a) is amended by adding the following new subparagraph:

"(3) The membership of each committee (and of each subcommittee, task force or subunit thereof), shall reflect the ratio of majority to minority party members of the House at the beginning of the Congress. This subparagraph shall not apply to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, which shall be constituted as provided for in subparagraph (2)."

(b) In Rule X, clause 6(e) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"The membership of each such select committee (and of each subcommittee, task force, or subunit thereof), and of each conference committee, shall reflect the ratio of majority to minority party Members of the House at the time of its appointment."

(7) In Rule X, clause 6(c) is amended to read as follows:

"(c)(1) Each standing committee of the House of Representatives (except the Committee on the Budget) that has more than twenty members, shall establish at least four subcommittees; but in no event shall any standing committee (except the Committee on Appropriations) establish more than six subcommittees.

"(2) No Member may serve at any one time as a member of more than four subcommittees of committees of the House of Representatives.

"(3) For the purposes of this paragraph the term 'subcommittee' includes any panel, task force, special subcommittee, or any subunit of a standing committee which is established for a period of longer than six months."

(8) In Rule XI, clause 2(f) is amended to read as follows:

"(f) No vote by any member of any committee or subcommittee with respect to any measure or matter may be cast by proxy."

(9) In Rule XI, clause 2(g)(2), insert before the period at the end thereof the following: "except that the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the subcommittees therein may, by the same procedure, vote to close up to five additional consecutive days of hearings."

(10) In Rule XI, clause 2(h)(2) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) A majority of the members of each committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of any business, including the markup of legislation."

(11) In Rule XI, clause 5 is amended by inserting the following new paragraph (a) and redesignating existing paragraphs accordingly:

"(a)(1) It shall not be in order in the House to consider any primary expense resolution until the Committee on House Administration has reported and the House has adopted a resolution establishing an overall ceiling for committee staff personnel for that year.

"(2) In developing any primary expense resolution for House committees, the Committee on House Administration shall specify in the resolution the number of staff positions authorized by the resolution. The committee shall indicate in the report on any such primary expense resolution that the number of staff positions authorized by such resolution is in conformity with the overall ceiling on such positions established by the House.

"(3) In no event shall the total number of additional staff positions authorized by all such primary expense resolutions, taken together with the number of staff positions authorized by clause 6 of this rule (providing for professional and clerical staff), exceed the ceiling established by the House for that year.

"(4) In allocating staff positions pursuant to the overall ceiling established by the House, the committee shall take into account the past and anticipated legislative and oversight activities of each committee, and the extent to which the allocation of majority to minority staff positions reflects

the ratio of majority to minority party members in the House."

"(5) In any supplemental expense resolution, the committee shall specify the number of additional staff positions, if any, authorized by such resolution, and shall indicate in the report on any such resolution whether the additional staff positions are in conformity with or exceed the overall ceiling established by the House.

"(6) It shall not be in order in the House to consider any supplemental expense resolution authorizing additional staff positions in excess of the overall ceiling established by the House except by a vote of two-thirds of the Members voting, a quorum being present."

(12) In Rule XXI, clause 5, insert "(a)" after "5." and insert at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(b) No bill or joint resolution carrying a tax or tariff measure shall be reported by any committee not having jurisdiction to report tax and tariff measures, nor shall an amendment in the House or proposed by the Senate carrying a tax or tariff measure be in order during the consideration of a bill or joint resolution reported by a committee not having that jurisdiction. A question of order on a tax or tariff measure in any such bill, joint resolution, or amendment thereto may be raised at any time."

(13) In Rule XXII, clause 5 is amended to read as follows:

"5. All resolutions of inquiry addressed to the heads of executive departments shall be reported to the House within fourteen legislative days after presentation."

BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE REPUBLICAN SUBSTITUTE FOR H. RES. 5

(Assuming the constitutional amendment discharge rule has already been dropped from the resolution)

The Republican substitute would delete the following four rules changes proposed by the Democratic Caucus:

(1) Permitting postponement of the vote on the Journal;

(2) Permitting removal of member from committee when no longer a member of the caucus or conference, without House action;

(3) Requiring rejection of motion to rise to permit limitation amendments to be offered to appropriations bills;

(4) Permitting Speaker to declare House is in Committee of Whole on a bill without House action.

The Republican substitute would retain the following four rules changes proposed by the Democratic Caucus:

(1) Permitting Clerk to supervise offices of Members deceased, retired, or expelled;

(2) Permitting extended days of closed hearings for Committees on Appropriations, Armed Services, and Intelligence;

(3) Prohibiting consideration of tax and tariff bills reported from non-tax committees;

(4) Permitting committees 7 additional days for committees to consider resolutions of inquiry.

In addition the Republican substitute would add the following nine amendments to the rules:

(1) Require TV coverage of House Chamber while Members are voting;

(2) Require committee approval of oversight plans, appointment of ad hoc oversight committees, and reference in final oversight reports to original plans;

(3) Abolish joint referral of bills, while retaining sequential and split referrals to committees;

(4) Require early election and organization of committees in a new Congress;

(5) Require party ratios on committees to reflect that of House (with Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, now bipartisan, only exception);

(6) Limit all committees, except Appropriations, to no more than six subcommittees, and all Members to no more than four subcommittee assignments;

(7) Ban all proxy voting in committees;

(8) Require majority quorums in committees for transacting all business;

(9) Require House to adopt overall committee staff ceiling each year before considering funding resolutions for individual committees.

OFFICE OF THE REPUBLICAN LEADER,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., December 16, 1982.

DEAR REPUBLICAN COLLEAGUE: This morning the House Republican Conference adopted a resolution concerning the proposed changes in rules proposed by the Democratic Caucus.

In addition, I informed the Conference that the Leadership is exploring the formation of a task force to deal with the rules changes, develop a strategy for combatting them and producing alternative proposals for presentation next month.

I am enclosing a copy of the resolution we adopted today, along with a summary of the Democratic Caucus rules amendments and those amendments we would like to see embodied in a Republican alternative package.

We intend to make a fight of the rules changes between now and the time they are on the Floor of the House. This is not a matter of internal conflict, but an issue that has far-reaching implications, not the least of which is the public's access to the legislative process and their ability to influence it through their elected representatives.

I urge you to call attention to the rules issue when you are home over the holidays and be prepared to wage an all out effort to defeat the Democratic leadership proposals in January.

Sincerely,

ROBERT H. MICHEL,
Republican Leader.

REPUBLICAN CONFERENCE RESOLUTION ON PROPOSED RULES CHANGES IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, DECEMBER 16, 1982

Whereas, the Rules of the House of Representatives are intended to provide the framework for open and free debate in the House and the mechanism for a truly democratic lawmaking process; and

Whereas, those rules are intended to protect the rights of duly elected representatives to affect the legislative process and mold national policy; and

Whereas, the Democratic Caucus has proposed restrictive, undemocratic and repressive rules changes for the 98th Congress which encroach upon the rights of the individual Members to work their will in the House of Representatives; and

Whereas, the proposed rules threaten the ability of the Members to exercise oversight of the expenditure of public funds through the appropriation process, deny a majority of the membership the opportunity to debate and vote on proposed amendments to the Constitution, and repudiate the constitutional requirement that Members be present during House proceedings for the conduct of public business; and

Whereas, the proposed rules further concentrate power in the hands of the Speaker

and a select few in the House to the extent that legislative decisions can be made arbitrarily and autocratically by a select few; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House Republican Conference does hereby oppose the amendments to the House Rules as proposed by the Democratic Caucus and considers them a form of political expediency at the expense of our democratic system; and be it further

Resolved, That the House Republican Conference pledges itself to an unending struggle in the House and the country to uphold the rights of individual Members to fully debate and vote on limiting spending through appropriations amendments, and to fully debate and vote on constitutional issues facing the nation, and to retain the two-centuries-old tradition of ensuring that a quorum is present when the business of the House is conducted; and be it further

Resolved, That the House Republican Conference does hereby call upon the full House to reject the rules changes and enact reforms that will address the seriously debilitating procedures and structural deficiencies in the House which have done so much damage to the efficient and effective operation of our national legislature.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF SUGGESTED REPUBLICAN AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE RULES—98TH CONGRESS

(1) Multiple Referral of Legislation—The joint referral of bills would be abolished in favor of designating a principal committee of jurisdiction for each bill introduced, but the Speaker would retain discretionary authority for sequential and split referral of bills.

(2) Subcommittee Limits—Rule X, clause 6(c) would be amended to limit each committee (except Appropriations) to no more than six subcommittees, and to limit Members to no more than four subcommittee assignments in the House.

(3) Staff Ceiling—Rule XI, clause 5 would be amended by inserting a new paragraph (a) to prohibit the consideration of any primary expense resolution for a committee until the House had adopted a resolution to be reported from the House Administration Committee establishing an overall committee staff ceiling for that year. Primary expense resolutions would include an allocation for staff consistent with the overall ceiling established, and the total number of statutory and investigative staff shall not exceed the overall ceiling. The House Administration Committee would take into account a committee's past and anticipated legislative and oversight activities in allocating investigative staff positions to each committee. Any supplemental expense resolutions must indicate whether additional staff positions are being authorized, and, if such positions exceed the overall ceiling established, a two-thirds vote of the House would be required to consider any such resolution.

(4) House Broadcasting—Rule I, clause 9(b)(1) would be amended to clarify the intent of the present broadcast rule that the "complete and unedited" broadcast coverage of House proceedings be provided to the media by requiring that the audio and visual coverage of the House Chamber be presented while Members are voting, including a visual presentation of the running vote tally.

(5) Party Ratios on Committees—Rule X, clause 6(a) would be amended to require that the party ratios on committees reflect

that of the House except for the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct (bipartisan) and Rules (two-thirds majority).

(6) Committee Elections and Organizations—Rule X, clause 6(a)(1) would be amended to require that the House elect its committees not later than five legislative days after the convening of a Congress. And Rule XI, clause 1(a) would be amended to require committees to hold their organizational meetings not later than eight legislative days after the convening of the Congress.

(7) Proxy Voting Ban—Rule XI, clause 2(f) would be amended to abolish all proxy voting on committees and subcommittees.

(8) Majority Quorum—Rule XI, clause 2(h)(2) would be amended to require a majority quorum on committees and subcommittees for the transaction of any business (presently a one-third quorum may transact any business except for the reporting of a measure which requires a majority present).

(9) Oversight—Rule X, clause 2(c) would be amended to require committees to formally adopt and submit to the Government Operations Committee by March 1 of the first session their oversight plans for that session, giving priority consideration to reviewing those laws, programs or agencies operating under permanent budget or statutory authority, and with a view to reviewing all significant laws, programs or agencies within their jurisdiction at least once every ten years. The Government Operations Committee, after consultation with the Speaker and majority and minority leaders, would report these plans to the House not later than March 15 together with any recommendations for coordination. The Speaker would be authorized to appoint ad hoc oversight committees to review matters within the jurisdiction of two or more committees. And, Rule XI, clause 1(d) would be amended to insure that each committee's final activity report at the end of a Congress include a separate section on its oversight accomplishments with reference to its original oversight plans.

SUMMARY OF DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS HOUSE RULES CHANGE PROPOSALS: 98TH CONGRESS

(1) Appropriations Riders Restrictions—Clause 2, Rule XXI would be amended to prevent the offering of limitation amendments on the Floor unless already authorized by law for the period covered by the bill or if the House votes down a motion that the Committee rise after other amendments have been disposed of. Limitation amendments could still be reported by the Appropriations Committee. The amendment also confines "retrenchment" amendments (e.g., those reducing salaries and personnel) to reductions in amounts of money covered by a bill, and to those recommended by the Appropriations Committee, thus precluding authorizing committees from offering retrenchment amendments on the Floor.

(2) Resolutions of Inquiry—Clause 5, Rule XXII would be amended to permit committees 14 legislative days to report back to the House after referral of such a resolution requesting information from the heads of executive departments. The current rule permits only 7 legislative days for reporting back to the House, after which a motion to discharge committee is in order.

(3) Closed Hearings—Clause 2(g)(2)(B), Rule XI, would be amended to permit the Committees on Appropriations, Armed Services and the Select Committee on Intelligence to vote in open session to close hearings for up to seven consecutive days. Cur-

rent House Rules permit all committees to vote to close hearings for two consecutive days.

(4) Resolving into the Committee of the Whole House—Clause 1, Rule XXIII would be amended to permit the Speaker to declare that the House is resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union at any time after the House had adopted a resolution from the Rules Committee providing for the consideration of a measure. Under present rules, the motion is subject to a vote by the House.

(5) Approval of the Journal—Clause 5(b)(1), Rule I would be amended to permit the Speaker to postpone a vote on the approval of the Journal until later in the same legislative day. Under present rules, approval of the journal is the second order of business in a legislative day and a vote may be demanded immediately.

(6) Committee Membership—Clause 6, Rule X would be amended to make removal from committee membership automatic once a Member ceases to be a member of his party caucus or conference. Members would still be elected to committees by vote of the House on nominations from the party caucuses. Under the interpretation of present rules, it would take a vote of the House to remove a Member from a committee.

(7) Tax Legislation—Clause 5, Rule XXI would be amended to prohibit non-tax committees from reporting any measure containing tax or tariff matters and the House from considering any amendment in the House or proposed by the Senate on a bill reported by a committee not having jurisdiction over tax matters.

(8) Constitutional Amendments—Clause 4, Rule XXVII would be amended to require that a discharge motion for an amendment to the Constitution, or a resolution referred to the Committee on Rules providing for the consideration of a constitutional amendment, must contain the signatures of two-thirds of the membership of the House in order to be called up in the House.

SURVEY

The attached survey of past appropriations limitation riders is by no means complete, but it is intended to provide a good sample of the diverse types of issues that have been brought to the House Floor by limitation riders over the past few years. If the Speaker succeeds in destroying this Floor procedure, the ability to bring these subjects and many others up for general debate and voting by the Members will be lost.

The riders on the attached list were drawn from a variety of sources. All the entries show the date of Floor action, and, where possible, the author of the rider has been included to indicate that many of them were sponsored by members of the majority party. Whether the rider passed or failed is irrelevant to our point that without the rider procedure, these issues would probably never have reached the Floor for debate.

A SURVEY OF APPROPRIATIONS LIMITATION RIDERS

The following limitation riders sought to prohibit the use of funds:

Vietnam war

To implement any plan to invade North Vietnam (3/16/67).

For the maintenance of more than 525,000 troops in Vietnam or for an invasion of North Vietnam (6/11/68).

To support combat activities in or over Cambodia or Laos (6/29/73; Flynt (D-Ga.)).

By the Department of Defense to finance combat activities in Cambodia (5/10/73; Long (D-Md.)).

Foreign affairs

From being used to supply military assistance, including military sales and credits, to Turkey until the President certified to Congress that "substantial progress toward agreement has been made regarding military forces in Cyprus." (9/24/74; Rosenthal (D-NY)—duPont (R-Del.)).

By the Central Intelligence Agency to undermine or destabilize the governments of foreign countries (9/24/74; Holtzman (D-NY)).

For financing direct aid to Mozambique or Angola (8/3/78).

For indirect aid to Chile, Argentina, Uruguay, Korea, Nicaragua, Indonesia, and the Philippines (8/3/78).

By the Commerce Department to promote or conduct trade relations with Cuba (6/14/79).

By the International Development Association to finance any assistance or reparations to the Socialist Republic of Vietnam (7/18/79).

For assistance to any government that grants sanctuary to any persons who have committed, or are being sought by any other government for prosecution for, a war crime (9/5/79).

For assassination plots against foreign officials and activities designed to influence foreign elections or political activities during peacetime (3/4/76; J. Burton (D-Cal.)).

For foreign aid to nations that were delinquent for more than one year in repaying principal or interest on debts owed the United States (3/4/76; Alexander (D-Ark.)).

Military

By the Coast Guard to reduce civilian employment below the fiscal 1981 level (9/10/81; Garry Studts (D-Mass.)).

For closure of any military installations designated in the amendment (10/2/75; Green (D-Pa.)).

To prohibit production of enhanced radiation weapons (6/16/78).

Civil rights

By the Civil War Centennial Commission for spending on activities held in facilities in which individuals are segregated or discriminated against because of race, religion or color (4/18/61).

For construction of hospitals having separate facilities on the basis of race, creed, or color (3/27/62).

Environment

For commercial flights of the supersonic transport jets to land at U.S. airports until the aircraft could meet federal noise standards (6/28/76; Yates (D-Ill.)).

For obtaining or issuing a license to operate the waste isolation pilot plant, Delaware Basin, southeast New Mexico, or for storage or radioactive waste at the plant not resulting from national defense activities of the Department of Energy (6/16/78).

For the Clinch River Breeder Reactor except funds for termination costs (12/14/82; Coughlin (R-NY)).

For the Bureau of Reclamation's O'Neill Irrigation Unit in Nebraska (12/14/82; Bonior (D-Mich.)).

For the Garrison Diversion water project in North Dakota (12/14/82; Conte (D-Mass.)).

Jobs and Buy America

For procurement of tactical support, or tracked or nontracked vehicles not manufactured in the United States, or its possessions, except for test and evaluation purposes (8/8/78).

For international institutions making loans establishing or expanding production of sugar, palm oil or citrus crops if the United States was a producer of the same or similar commodities (6/23/77; Moore (R-La.)).

For international institutions to establish or expand the production for export of steel, grains, sugar, palm oil, citrus crops, tobacco, or tires (8/14/78).

For a requirement that at least 10 percent of the workers on a public works project funded under the bill must reside in the area in which the project was located (8/25/76; Wright (D-Tx.)).

Oversight and deregulation

For CETA to pay prisoners for work performed prior to the presumptive release date of such prisoner (6/27/79).

By the Federal Buildings Fund to enter into, renew or extend any lease where the lessor has failed to fulfill the requirements of a contract involving funds derived from the Slum Clearance and Urban Renewal Program (7/16/79).

For collection of underpayment of any IRS-imposed tax unless the IRS employees comply with certain provisions of the Fair Debt Collection Practice Act (7/13/79).

By the Occupational Safety and Health Administration to issue penalties for first violations of federal safety and health rules by firms employing 25 or fewer persons (6/25/74; Findley (R-Ill.)).

For fines against farmers who employed five or fewer employees for violation of Occupational Safety and Health Administration regulations, unless the violations were willful, repeated or serious (6/24/76; Ford (D-Mich.)).

For first instance citations for OSHA violations against businesses that employed 10 or fewer persons (6/24/76; Findley (R-Ill.)).

By the Labor Department to aid illegal aliens (6/27/79).

Abortion and busing and other social issues

By HEW to issue regulations or withhold funds from school districts in order to force them to integrate physical education classes, fraternities and youth service organizations by sex (4/16/75; Casey (D-Tx.)).

For federal employee health insurance policies that provide abortions (5/13/81; Ashbrook (R-Oh.)).

For federal funding of abortions except where the life of the mother would be in danger if the fetus is carried to term (8/9/78).

By the Justice Department to bring action to require the busing of students, except those requiring special education resulting from physical or mental handicaps (7/21/79).

For the formulation or carrying out of any rule or policy which would cause the loss of tax-exempt status to private, religious or church-oriented schools unless in effect prior to August 22, 1978 (7/13/79).

□ 1410

It will be my intention at the conclusion of the debate, Mr. Speaker, to offer a motion to vote down the previous question. Assuming that will fail, then we will offer a motion to commit the legislation, to strike the rider on

appropriation bills, and hope that our package of substitute rules will prevail on final passage.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT).

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, shortly after last November's election results were in, several prominent Democrats were quoted as saying, "We now have a working majority; we now have policy control in the House."

Well, you sure would not know it by looking at this package of House rules proposals out of the Democratic Caucus. Instead they seem to be the paranoid palpitations of an imperiled party.

Not only do these rules changes trample on the rights of the minority in the House, but they betray a cynical disregard for majority rule as well. They seem to be saying, "The House cannot be trusted to govern itself or the country." Instead, let us surrender to the paternalism of King Caucus and Czar Speaker.

The proponents of these changes seem to be saying: "Save us from ourselves; save us from having to vote on the issues; make our decisions for us."

Mr. Speaker, this is not the people's democracy at work; it is political cultism and wimpism at their worst.

I would ask my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle: What is it that you are afraid of? If you have this new policy control in the House, why are you afraid to confront policy issues head-on? Why all this hiding behind these new no-votes, no-quorums, no-amendments rules?

I guess we should be thankful that this new profile in cowardice has led to the dumping of the new discharge rule for constitutional amendments that would have prevented a House majority from bringing such matters to the floor. At least we can claim some victory on this side for raising the public consciousness enough to force that change.

But that still leaves us with a poor excuse for congressional reform. Four of the eight remaining rules changes would virtually, first, eliminate the constitutionally required quorum for doing business in the House, second, deprive the House of a vote on taking up a bill, third, strip the House of a vote on removing Members from committees, and fourth, severely restrict if not eliminate the right of Members to offer limitation amendments on appropriations bills.

Let us take a look at that last one because it goes to the heart and soul of the power of the Congress—the power of the purse. James Madison, writing in *Federalist* Number 58 put it this way:

This power over the purse may, in fact, be regarded as the most complete and effectual weapon with which any constitution can arm the immediate representatives of the

people for obtaining a redress of every grievance, and for carrying into effect every just and salutary measure.

And yet, this new restriction on appropriations amendments would severely undermine the congressional power over the purse. And ironically this rule is being proposed by many of the same people who not too many years ago were inveighing against the imperial presidency and for a resurgent Congress. Now they want to lessen control of the Congress over the executive branch by denying us the right to offer limitation amendments to appropriations bills.

I would caution my colleagues that if you adopt this change you will be cutting the purse strings you now have on the executive branch and will once again be tying yourselves to its apron strings.

Whatever happened to my friends on the other side of the aisle who were once genuinely interested and concerned about making this institution work, rather than simply finding new ways to duck the issues? Why does not your rules package address some of the real problems we have around here, first, the problems of jumbled committee jurisdictions and joint bill referral; second, the problems of too many subcommittees and too much staff; the problems of low quality and unrepresentative legislation due to committee, and fourth, proxy voting, miniquorums, and skewed party ratios?

We have a positive and constructive rules package on this side to address these problems if the previous question is voted down. I would urge my colleagues to turn back the cowardly caucus package and for the Republican alternative that is designed to make this a more responsible, workable and accountable Congress.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP).

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise in the hope that this body will vote down the previous question. I thank the gentleman from Illinois and also my friend from Mississippi for their very articulate discussion of how important the rules are to this body.

Mr. Speaker, Representative O'NEILL in assuming the speakership of this body said that the Founding Fathers considered the House of Representatives to be the first—the very, very first—body of Government. Here was the place in which the people every 2 years could register their concerns by voting for or against the Members of the House of Representatives as the First Branch of Government. The gentleman from Mississippi clearly put us on record as recognizing that, going back to the Founding Fathers, to the *Federalist* Papers, to the Constitution of the United States, the

power of the purse made this branch of Government the First Branch of Government.

It is the power of the purse as articulated by James Madison in Federalist Paper No. 58 that gives the people's representatives the ability to shape legislation according to their demands. Indeed, it goes back not just to the Constitutional Convention, it goes to the Magna Carta. In our democratic tradition it was the Magna Carta that separated the king from the legislative body and gave the people control over the purse strings through their elected representatives.

APPROPRIATIONS AS LAW

In the years I have served in this House, we have been increasingly hamstrung in attempts to pass legislation of substantive law, the so-called authorizing legislation. In its place we have come to rely on the passage of appropriations bills, often themselves only in the form of continuing resolutions, to set the law of the land as well as to provide for public expenditure.

But now, at the beginning of the 98th Congress, the Democratic Party Caucus rules recommends that we give up the greatest constitutional power of the House of Representatives, the power of the purse; they recommend that the people's representatives give up a major portion of our power to restrict the manner in which the resources entrusted to us are used.

Before you pass judgment on these restrictions, whether you are liberal or conservative, reflect on a few of the measures which this House has passed by means of restricting appropriations:

Specific limitations on the Vietnam War.

The invasion of North Vietnam;

Limitation of foreign aid to hostile nations;

Prohibition of the promotion of trade with Cuba;

Enforcement of civil rights legislation;

Restrictions of abortions financed with Federal funds;

Restrictions on forced busing of school children;

Prohibition of rules or policies affecting the tax status of private schools;

Requirements that local labor be used on federally funded public works projects.

These may be small examples to some, and they may be large to others, but this body has had an opportunity to shape legislation by the use of the people's purse strings. As the gentleman from Mississippi so eloquently pointed out, it would be a horrible mistake. It is not just partisan. It is giving up the constitutional responsibility, something that the Founding Fathers fought for, if we should subject this body to a rule that is so inimical to the future of our constitutional responsibilities.

These examples cross all party and ideological lines. They provide the very best examples of the demand of the people that the public purse be used in a manner reflecting the public will.

This is not a partisan view, yet it is being used partisan. The distinguished majority leader has long advocated the use of such restrictions and has defended them as a fundamental right of the Congress. Indeed, he has availed himself of their use. Consider his words:

Surely the right of the Congress to enact a specific limitation on the use of tax monies for any such purpose is a right long established . . . a right without which Congress could not perform its duty to the American taxpayer . . . a right indispensable to the legislative branch in carrying out its constitutional responsibility.

The majority leader is eloquent in his defense of the rights of the people's branch. I agree with him. I only wonder how his caucus, ably led by him and the distinguished Speaker, could suggest to the House that we bind our hands in the use of such fundamental rights. How is it that the majority side, which can have any bill or any amendment offered virtually at its will can feel threatened by the exercise by Members of a fundamental right of the legislative branch?

CONSIDERATION OF AUTHORIZING LEGISLATION

Perhaps the Speaker and the majority leader are frustrated, as many are, with the inability of the House to move authorizing legislation through the committees to the floor for consideration by all Members. I join them in this frustration as I know my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi, does.

Many times on this floor and in the Appropriations Committee we have heard the chairman decry the use of his bills as a means of enacting authorizations. He has made incisive and valuable points, many times gaining my complete agreement.

But, I remind my colleagues that there are remedies for this frustration which do not restrict the rights and privileges of the people's Representatives. If we are unable to move legislation in an orderly manner, the answer lies elsewhere than in the restriction of our constitutional responsibilities.

In the rules changes proposed by the minority, we have recommended that the committee system be tightened to assure that there is a single committee responsible for each piece of legislation which is offered in this House. Further, we have recommended that the number of subcommittees with responsibility for legislation be reduced and that the staff be restricted to a manageable size, that is, to a size at which the Members control the staff.

Reforms of this type will establish clear lines of accountability for legislation. They complement the open com-

mittee rules which have provided additional public scrutiny of our deliberations. Their adoption will prevent us from continuing a system which has rapidly evolved from one of secret action to one of total inaction. If legislation is stalled, there will be a single committee which bears the responsibility.

I do not suggest that these reforms will eliminate the practice of limiting restrictive riders on appropriations bills or that they should eliminate that practice. I suggest, rather, that the legitimate concerns of Members over the practice of legislating on appropriations bills are better handled by improving the legislative process than by tampering with constitutional prerogatives.

CONSTITUTIONAL QUORUM

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Caucus brings before us two further rules changes which I believe constitute a fundamental attack on the Constitution. These rules, one restricting votes on the previous day's Journal and one allowing the Speaker, rather than the Members, to determine when to resolve into the Committee of the Whole, would allow the House of Representatives to conduct the vast majority of its business without the presence of a quorum.

In our Constitution, article I, section 5, clause 1 clearly states that "A majority of each House shall constitute a quorum to do business." Under the proposed rules, the Speaker, the Members and, most importantly, the people, would have no notion of the presence or absence of a quorum. Indeed, there would be no assurance of the presence in Washington of more Members than might be present on the floor at a given moment.

While seeming to facilitate the orderly conduct of business, these new rules would virtually eliminate the ability of a Member to assure that the constitutional mandate is followed. We do not serve the Nation by setting rules so as to thwart the Constitution and deceive the electorate.

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

The Democratic Caucus, in its proposed changes, would further remove constitutional powers from the House by establishing the party caucus as arbiter of committee assignments. It would alter the status of Members based solely on the actions of not only their caucus, but, in some cases, on the actions of the caucus chairman. The rule would stipulate that a Member's committee assignment is null and void at any time when the caucus chairman notifies the Speaker that the Member has ceased to be a member of that caucus.

This rule, Mr. Speaker, would remove power not just from the House, but from the electorate of the Member in question. Stripped of com-

mittee assignments, the Member effectively would be removed from the daily operation of the Congress; he would be unable to represent his district in a viable manner. I suggest that placing such power outside the full consideration of the House jeopardizes the very substance of representative democracy.

CONCLUSION

Before we vote today on these rules, I again ask each of you to reflect on your action, on its meaning for the coming session and, more importantly, for the preservation of representative democracy.

We should take no action which restricts the open and orderly debate of public issues. Equally, we should never cast a vote which restricts the access of an honorable and constructive minority of our peers to debate on this floor.

I urge you to vote down these changes.

□ 1420

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. FIEDLER).

Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Speaker, in a debate heard on this floor in July of 1970, one of our most distinguished colleagues made a number of statements, and I would like to share them with the House at this time. It was a discussion about issues related to amendments, and it is as follows:

Often the most important parts of a bill and usually the most controversial sections are decided on in amendment form and there is no record of how Members vote. This is not a good system. It is not fair, and it subverts the integrity and reputation of the House and its Members. There should be no one among us who is not willing to go on record on the vital issues of the day.

Votes on final passage, on previous questions, and on recommittal are only part of the record. The whole truth means that we must have a record on amendment votes. I believe it is fair, it is necessary, and it is in keeping with democratic principles of representative government. In this day and age I believe the people are entitled to know how we vote on legislation, not just on the entire bill but on the all-important amendments.

Mr. Chairman, let me say this to you: That the trivial things of today are the important things of tomorrow.

That was quoting the Honorable Tip O'NEILL.

It seems to me that we have come a long way to have reached the point where the majority party which enjoys a substantial majority, is unwilling to permit those of us who are the Representatives elected by the people of this country to engage in a debate and also vote on important issues. It seems to me that what we are doing in this process is providing the Appropriations Committee by majority to act in abstentia for the majority of the Members of the House of Representatives. I believe that is inappropriate.

Mr. Speaker, if I might again quote the Speaker, today he said, "The American people want action, not partisan bickering," give us an opportunity to take action on the important issues we will face in the next 2 years.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COUGHLIN).

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, let us be very clear on what we are doing here today.

The proposed rule changes that we are talking about are not just aimed at the minority in this House, they are targeted very directly at permitting a select few to thwart the will of the majority of this great body.

I hope my colleagues will think carefully about that because these rules will be with us at least for 2 years. I particularly address myself to our new colleagues on both sides of the aisle who believe that they are coming here to vote on the great issues they talked about during their election campaigns, only to find they will be foreclosed from doing so by these very rules.

Authorizing legislation on sensitive issues often does not come to the floor in timely fashion. The only opportunity we had last year, for example, to vote on the Clinch River breeder reactor was through a limiting amendment on an appropriations bill, and regardless of one's position on the issue, the House deserved to have a vote on that. That kind of vote to be able to limit the use of funds would be made much more difficult under these rules.

Over the sweep of history, major issues—funds for the Vietnam war, the antiballistic missile system, supersonic transport, abortion, segregation, and civil rights—issues that cut in different directions have all been handled through appropriation riders. It has always been the prerogative of this body to limit the way we spend our money—to limit the use of funds we appropriate.

It is a question of the quality of our institution. In the years of the seventies many of us fought successfully to open up the legislative process. Now we are going to erode those gains of those years and go back to having major legislative decisions made behind closed doors in smoke-filled rooms by a handful of people.

Mr. Speaker, if we have pride in our institution, if we have pride in the historic function of this House as a deliberative body, if we have pride in our own ability to face major issues, we must not permit this retreat into ignominy. I hope that my colleagues will vote down the previous question.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DANNEMEYER).

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, we have, by one historian's count, 55 democratically elected representative bodies in the Western World. In every

single one of these democratically elected representative bodies except one committee slots are apportioned consistent with the division of parties in the whole House. The one exception is the House of Representatives.

I happen to believe that this disparity should not exist. It is unfair, in my humble opinion. It denies equal protection of the law to members of the minority, and I believe it to be unconstitutional.

The issue came up, for instance, in the 96th Congress when Republicans, the minority members, were shorted 15 slots on major committees and 58 slots on subcommittees. In the 97th Congress we Republicans, the minority members, were shorted 30 slots on major committees and 37 slots on subcommittees. The proposed division of slots in the 98th Congress, beginning today, so far indicates that we members of the minority will be shorted 12 slots. The subcommittees have not yet been organized.

Just to give some idea to the Members of what this meant during the 97th Congress, we members of the minority were shorted four on the Appropriations Committee, two on the Budget Committee, three on the Rules Committee, and six on the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. Speaker, we know that it is on the Ways and Means Committee that the tax policy of the country is fixed, and it is regrettable that we were not able to have our proper allocation on that very important committee.

It has often been said, perhaps more as a matter of political rhetoric than of practical necessity, that the first two or three votes a Member casts during a Congress are the most important. Today, rhetoric notwithstanding, that adage has more than the usual meaning. For today we are not only selecting the person who will lead this body but we are considering a package of proposals that will drastically change the process of deliberation within this body. Or perhaps I should say curtail the process of deliberation.

Mr. Speaker, the Constitution, the Federalist Papers, and numerous other works have given intellectual life to the idea that the House of Representatives is that body which exists to reflect the will of the majority while the role of the other body is to defend the rights of the minority. However, it has been a long time since the rights of the minority in the House have been completely ignored and, even more importantly, the idea that a majority within the House on a given issue or issues can be denied its rights if their view does not happen to coincide with the views of the leadership, or of certain committee or subcommittee chairman has never received much acceptance. Indeed, if I recall my history correctly, the House has fought several

major battles over the extent to which control will be exercised—Speaker Reed was not called Czar for nothing—and ultimately it was decided the majority did have rights and, to a certain extent, so too did the minority within the House. However, if we adopt the rules changes being proposed today those rights will be seriously eroded.

Perhaps the greatest irony of all this is that many of those supporting these rules changes have benefited from the very procedures that these proposed rules seek to change. The new rules on riders would have made it difficult, had they been in effect earlier, to restrict funding for various aspects of the Vietnam war, for federally funded abortions, and for a variety of other things various Members of both parties have been concerned about. Does the majority party want to deny the right to limit offshore drilling off our northwest coast if that is what a majority of this House, if not the committee of jurisdiction, would prefer? Does the majority party want to remove the option of eliminating funding for military aid to El Salvador in the event a continuation of that funding is approved in committee? Does the majority want to stop efforts on the floor to restrict funding for Corps of Engineers projects or projects like the Clinch River breeder reactor even though most of its own Members would just as soon terminate these projects. Yes or no. If yes, then let me suggest that the Members of that party may come to rue the day such changes were approved regardless of whatever short-term considerations may exist at present. If no, then I would suggest that Members of the majority party join with Members of the minority party to adopt some rules changes that will not only protect the rights of individual Members but will bring greater fairness to House proceedings.

Other Members are going to be discussing the procedural aspects of these proposals in some detail, so let me focus on the fairness aspect. Fairness, as well as the constitutional principle of "one man-one vote", clearly suggests that committees of the House—all the committees—be organized on the same basis as the House itself. That is to say, their membership should have the same ratio of Democrats to Republicans as exists in the House as a whole. However, that is not the case today and, what is more disturbing, in the last two Congresses—three of the minority rules package is not adopted today—the trend has been away from, rather than in the direction of, that objective. The result has been that bills that might have been reported had a truly proportional ratio of majority to minority members existed on the committee in question have not been reported. Conversely, there have been instances when bills have been defeated in com-

mittee that might not have been had a proper ratio existed. The Ways and Means Committee in the past Congress is an excellent example; no less than eight committee votes would likely have been different had a truly proportional system of party representation on the committee existed.

This inequity does not stop with the membership on committees either. Unfortunately, it is even more pronounced at the staff level, further exaggerating the advantage of the majority party and further distorting the eventual work product of the committees themselves. In the 96th Congress, for instance, the minority party had just over 36 percent of the seats in the entire House but only 15 percent on average of the investigative staff slots on the committees. This is hardly fair. For instance, how can the minority on an Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee do the job expected when they only have one-eighth or one-ninth of the resources of the majority. Or how can the minority members on a full committee be as fully prepared as majority members when they have 20 percent or less of the staff slots. Is it any wonder then that delaying tactics in committee sometimes have to be resorted to.

The minority rules package before this body today would address both of these problems by simply providing that the membership and staffs of committees be based on the same ratio of majority to minority members that exists in the House of Representatives itself. If the other body can operate on such a basis, and every other parliamentary democracy in the Western World can operate on that basis, then so can this body. I urge my colleagues to adopt the minority rules proposals so that fair committee ratios can become a fact of life.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BREAU).

Mr. BREAU. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to make some comments on what I think to be a bad recommendation on the part of our Democratic Caucus to the full House.

What this rule really will mean is that if you would like to eliminate funds for busing on one hand or if you would like to eliminate any funds for the B-1 bomber, or if you would like to eliminate any funds for the MX missile, or if you would have liked to eliminate any funds for our involvement in the Vietnam war, or if you would have liked to eliminate any funds for the CIA's subversive activities, for instance, in Latin America, you would just about be precluded from doing so under this new rule.

Those who argue in favor of the rule say, "Well, we need to eliminate all these frivolous amendments."

I had the Library of Congress do some research, and I found that last

year there were offered only 21 amendments that were limitation amendments on appropriations bills. That is throughout 1982. It happened only 21 times. Last year we voted 859 times, and only 21 times were those votes on limitations on appropriation riders.

What we are doing today by this recommendation is to create a situation whereby we will be protected from voting on issues that are not comfortable to vote on. But, after all, that is why we were sent here. How are we going to be able to justify to our people back home by saying, "I didn't vote your way because I didn't have the chance to offer an amendment because we changed our rules."

I fought this rule in our Democratic Caucus. It was a fair fight. I made my points, and I lost the argument in the Democratic Caucus. I believe in the majority rule, and I think the rules that were established in the caucus were fair and I accept that verdict. But what I will be trying to do is to do whatever I can to try to get my Democratic Caucus to see the error of their ways in recommending this rule and get that rule changed.

But I do accept the ruling of the Democratic Caucus. I think it is a mistake, and I think we do great violence to the system by adopting this rule. However, I do support the rules, knowing full well that I will have my opportunities to make my arguments in the caucus.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LUNGREN).

□ 1430

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, the problem with what is going on today is that it very much is going to be voted, most probably, on partisan lines. There will be the claims that this is merely a partisan issue, Democrats versus Republicans, that the Democrats have made their decision in their caucus and so be it.

But, Mr. Speaker, that makes today very much a bittersweet day. "Bittersweet," as defined in the dictionary, is pleasant but including or marked by elements of suffering or regret.

This is a joyous occasion because most of us have been sworn in, many of us for the first time, with our families present. It is not the day that we want to do battle but, nonetheless, this is the only day that we have.

The fact of the matter is that what we are doing by adopting these rules is allowing a procedural bottleneck to be imposed before we can even debate, much less vote on some of the most important substantial issues that have confronted us in the past.

Let us just bring it out on the table and talk about one of those issues, usually embodied in something called

the Hyde amendment. The Hyde amendment has been adopted so overwhelmingly in this House recently that we barely even debate its details. We vote it through. But under this rule we may not even have the opportunity to debate or vote on the question.

Why? Because we will have a procedural vote. The same arguments being used against majority Members today will be used against majority Members when those votes take place. They will be told: "Vote with the leadership. It is a procedural vote. It is not a substantive vote. If you cannot vote with the leadership, then you are not being a regular member of the party."

You can do it on the rule and then you are going to do it as we bring up issues on the environment, as we bring up issues of busing, as we bring up issues on voluntary prayer, as we bring up votes on abortion.

If we accept this rules change, we are not serving our constituents well. We cannot hide very long by going home and saying, "I am sorry, that vote never came up. I did not vote on it. I voted on a question of whether we should rise as a committee. It is a procedural matter. If I explained it to you, you would not understand it anyway, so just understand that I did not get the opportunity."

We are doing a disservice to our constituents. I can understand how many individuals would not want to deal with those issues because they are so controversial. But we have been elected by the people to face these issues and if we fail to do that we fail our constitutional requirements.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ROTH).

Mr. ROTH. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding me this time.

I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the previous speakers who I think made some very cogent and well-reasoned arguments.

On this, the first day of the 98th Congress, we should approve rules that will allow opportunity to offer amendments. It would be a sad omen if we were to start the 98th Congress by swallowing hook, line, and sinker the dictates of the Democratic Caucus. We must allow the Members of this House, in all fairness, to have alternative viewpoints, at least, considered.

The old aphorism that we are all familiar with is that, "a dictatorship is more efficient than a democracy, but who wants to live under a dictatorship." That is as I see these rule changes. Not that this House will turn into a dictatorship, but rather, that under the guise of efficiency the new rules will hamstring the minority. No one would openly advocate gag rules for this body, but basically that is what we are doing with the changes in these rules.

Since the early seventies, Congress has dealt with the most important, the most controversial parts of a bill, by the amending process. These changes would make it nearly impossible for the House, acting as the Committee of the Whole, to take these important initiatives. Action by amendment was successful in restricting funding of pork barrel projects, escalating and experimental defense expenditures, precluding excursions into countries counter to our foreign policy, and protecting the rights of those concerned for social legislation.

Certainly, the work of Congress is largely done in committee, but certain issues, important yet controversial, require the fresh air and sunlight assured by debate in the Committee of the Whole. To rescind this rule, this right for the peoples' voice, our constituents' concerns to be heard, can only be viewed as an attempt to seize excessive control, to gag Members, by an elite few of the majority party leadership.

Defeating these proposed rule changes is the goal of both liberals and conservatives, Democrats and Republicans. They should be defeated in the interest of fairness, orderly conduct of House business, and serving the constituencies that elected the newly sworn Members of the 98th Congress, House of Representatives.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. PASHAYAN).

Mr. PASHAYAN. Mr. Speaker, in a parliamentary sense there is only one minority in this House and that is the minority belonged to by members of my party. This minority has its rights, rights that go back not only as my leader and our whip has referred to earlier in this debate, in the history of this country, but far back into the parliamentary history of England, the parliamentary history that formed the foundation for our Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, the office you hold is an office that was created in the 14th century. Throughout, in the long time from then until now, the Speaker and the office of the Speaker has developed into the role internally of representing the whole institution.

The rights of the minority have always been one of the leading rights in the history of any parliamentary institution in Western democracy. The Speaker is as much the guardian of the whole House and of all of the Members as he is in any other single role that he plays.

I listened carefully to the words of the Speaker today when he described this body as being the greatest legislative body in the greatest democracy in the history of the world. There can be no great democracy without a free parliamentary institution and there cannot be a free parliamentary institu-

tion without free debate and action within that body.

Yet the majority party in this House would bind the Members on this side of the aisle, would lock us in an iron mask of silence.

I ask all Members to consider the tradition of freedom that has long endured, first in the Parliament and then in this House, formed on the basis of the parliamentary foundation, and to reject this rule of closure, so untraditional and unconstitutional in our long and august history.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WYLIE).

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the previous question. The rules changes are plainly designed to reduce the role of the minority.

That this was the intent was clearly evidenced by the suggested change in the rule which would have required 290 signatures on a discharge petition. Now that proposed change has been dropped. But it was so plainly, blatantly political as to be outrageous.

The suggested rule change entitled "appropriation riders restriction" is really a very mischievous amendment. The present rule is a tool for the minority which has been used effectively to thwart the intransigence of committee chairmen and allow Members to debate such volatile issues of national concern as school prayer, abortion, school busing, the Concorde SST, and aid to Cuba. As the very courageous gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BREAU) mentioned, for this reason we should vote against this change in the rules.

An amendment can be offered, as I read the rule, which would reduce the amount or delete it, but if a specific subject is not mentioned in the appropriation bill there is nothing the minority can do to get at that subject even though money might be spent for an otherwise objectionable purpose.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think, as Mr. MICHEL has suggested, this is not a good rule. We should vote down the previous question and change it.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule change proposed by the House Democratic Caucus. These changes fly in the face of representative government and, if adopted by this body, will fundamentally—and irrevocably—change our legislative process.

The Democratic Caucus' rules threaten the public's access to the law-making process; they threaten the public's ability to influence that process through their elected Representatives; and they threaten the ability of individual Members of this body to

affect the legislative process and mold national policy.

By prohibiting riders on appropriations bills, we lose one effective instrument in controlling, or at least curbing, the wasteful spending habits of this body. The people of this Nation must know how and why we vote to spend their hard-earned tax dollars. To cloud our votes in secrecy is to deny to our constituents the representation guaranteed by the Constitution. We must not allow this to happen.

Second, the proposed procedural rules regarding the adoption of the Journal and on resolving into a Committee of the Whole will unquestionably reduce the time we spend in this Chamber. In our absence, it will be all but impossible to prevent bad legislation from slipping onto the floor without either legislative or public scrutiny.

Together these changes add up to the one thing: A reduction in the legislative restraint and scrutiny that the Constitution and our constituents demand. I urge my colleagues to reject the proposed rule.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAGOMARSINO).

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I find it ironic that a party which calls itself "Democratic" would propose rules changes so obviously designed to stifle debate and limit open discussion in our Nation's greatest legislative body, the House of Representatives.

And I find it equally disturbing that the press, which is usually so vigilant in safeguarding the public's right to know and its own access to the deliberations of this body, has not blown the whistle on the leadership. Perhaps it was the numbing effect of the final week's debate at the end of the lame-duck session, or perhaps it was simply overlooked in the clutter of moving from one session of Congress to another.

However, as those final days made abundantly clear, there is nothing so basic to the operations of this body than the rules of the House, and the opportunity those rules present for influencing the outcome of our deliberations is clear.

Equally clear, at least to me, is that the changes being proposed by the Democratic leadership have only one purpose—to run roughshod over the rights of individual Members of this body, on both sides of the aisle, whenever they disagree with the views of the leadership. In so doing, they also trample the intentions of the Founding Fathers and the Constitution itself into the dust.

Article I, section 5 of the Constitution specifically provides that Congress must have a quorum present to conduct business. Postponement of votes on the Journal and eliminating votes on consideration of bills, as pro-

posed in these rules, would allow the leadership to conduct legislative business and debate bills without the constitutionally required majority quorum. The result will be "phantom" legislating, and denial of representation to people who have elected us to be here when laws are made.

The American Revolution was fought over the issue of taxation without representation, and delegates to the Constitutional Convention considered this such an important issue that it was put into the very first article of the Constitution. Yet these proposed rules casually dispense with this essential safeguard, in the interest of "efficiency."

Equally disturbing is the proposal to vastly expand the powers of certain committees to close their doors to the public and the press. Under these rules, the Committee on Appropriations, for example, could decide to close its doors for up to 7 consecutive days, effectively excluding the public and other Members from deliberations on some of the most important bills dealt with in the House. Yet, where is the outcry from the press or from members of the majority, the Democratic Party?

Other rules changes are equally damaging to the principle of representative democracy. How can you square rules which, in this case, prevent the offering of amendments to appropriations bills on the House floor, or automatically remove a member from a committee for adhering to his conscience—how can you square such rules with principles of democracy and equal representation? You cannot, Mr. Speaker, and I think all of us here know that.

Instead of trying to stifle debate and block the open consideration of bills, we should be trying to open up the rules of this body, along with its processes. Is not the image of Congress bad enough? Do we have to add insult to injury by enacting these restrictive and repressive rules changes—after just voting ourselves a big pay raise?

I urge the Members of this House, on both sides of the aisle, to consider the damage they are doing to the institution of Congress, to constitutional principles of fairness and equal representation, to the underlying bedrock of public confidence in Government, by these cynical attempts to establish a tyranny in the leadership of what should be the most representative body on Earth.

We should reject these illegitimate seizures of power out of hand. Instead, we should move to make this a body we can be proud of, by adopting the alternative rules in the motion to be offered by Mr. MICHEL. These changes would require, for example, full TV coverage of floor activity, abolish proxy voting in committees, require majority quorums in committee to

conduct business, and require that party ratios on committees reflect the true composition of the House.

These, Mr. Speaker, are changes which are long overdue, which will bring merit upon the Members of the House, and which will make this body more accessible to the public whom we represent. I urge all Members who care about the integrity, reputation, and future of this body, to vote against the previous question and reject the rules proposed by the leadership.

□ 1440

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRENZEL).

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, for the seventh consecutive time, I shall vote against the rules. I get neither enjoyment nor consolation from voting "no." I simply feel compelled to vote against the whole package because the majority in this House does not let us vote on the separate, controversial elements.

Two of the rules changes are controversial, and should be given separate consideration, and a separate vote. They are the elimination of limiting amendments to appropriations bills and the elimination of a vote to determine whether a necessary quorum is present in the House.

I oppose each of those changes, particularly the one that prevents limiting amendments to appropriations. They simply lighten up the rules so the whole House is denied some of its few opportunities to discuss and vote on issues the majority leadership would rather avoid.

When I first came to Congress, the reformers, including myself were pressing for recorded votes in the Committee of the Whole. The rationale was that the leadership and the Committee Chairmen were not allowing important issues to be openly discussed and noted for the record.

Those reforms were achieved, but the reformers, now in the leadership, have slipped backward into the position of suppressing debate. Those ex-reformers, now the defenders of the status quo, seem to have forgotten that this is the people's House.

The people who sent us here expect important issues to be debated and voted here. They do not expect the leadership of the House to stifle discussion of matters that it may find unpleasant.

Since these rules will suppress debate of critical and unpleasant issues, I must vote against them.

In addition, the rules presented do not contain real reforms on which the House has worked without success for years. There is no rule to prevent proxy voting, or to require a full quorum for committee business. There

is no rule to prevent joint referral. There is no rule to insure honest party ratios on every committee. There is no rule to reduce the number of subcommittees and their staffs. There is no rule to improve oversight functions of committees. There are no rules to improve the budget process. There are no rules to speed up the operations of the Houses.

In general, the rules presented are what might be expected from a king caucus majority, without confidence in itself, unsure of its program, and afraid of the problems it faces.

There is, however, one splendid improvement hidden among the noxious weeds of the new rules. It is the change in rule XXI, clause 5, which will allow points of order against tax revenue measures which are attached to nonrevenue bills either in the Senate or in the House. This change provides a more orderly process under which the Congress can consider tax matters.

The House will no longer be forced to accept tax provisions from the Senate attached to nontax bills. This rules change gives the House new strength in dealing with the other body, and will improve House procedures, too.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MADIGAN) who headed up the task force for taking a look at the proposed rules proposed by the Democratic Caucus.

Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I think it is clear to everybody in the House that what we really have here is an attempt being made by the majority party to eliminate the possibility of the conservative Members of the House being able to offer amendments to appropriations bills. So we have done some research, just to see who the people really are who offered these amendments and what these amendments really have been in the past.

For example, on May 10, 1973, Mr. LONG of Maryland offered the amendment to prohibit the Department of Defense from financing combat activities in Cambodia. Mr. ROSENTHAL from New York offered the amendment to prohibit Federal funds from being used to supply military assistance to Turkey. Ms. Holtzman from New York offered the amendment to prohibit the Central Intelligence Agency from undermining or destabilizing the governments of foreign countries. Mr. BURTON, from California, to prohibit Federal funds from being used to finance assassination plots against foreign officials. Mr. ALEXANDER, from Arkansas, to prohibit Federal funds for foreign aid to nations that are delinquent in repaying their debts to us. To prohibit the production of enhanced radiation weapons, by Mr. BURTON of

California. To prohibit Federal funds from being used for construction of hospitals having separate facilities, segregated on the basis of race, an amendment to an appropriation bill, an issue that otherwise would have never gotten to the floor of the House of Representatives.

That is hardly a list of conservative issues. That is a list of the kinds of issues that will be prohibited from being debated on the floor of this House in a robust manner or any manner whatsoever if the rules being promulgated by the gentleman from Texas are adopted.

It is not a comprehensive list that I have just read to the Members, but I think it is a very instructive list because it shows that what you are going to stop is not conservative action alone. What you are going to stop is the very thing that the Democratic Party says that it wants to do. And you are not going to stop the conservative amendments from being offered to appropriations bills.

The two gentlemen from North Carolina who nearly shut the Senate down in the lameduck session are still going to be there. These rules that we adopt here do not obtain in the Senate of the United States. The other body is still going to be able to do whatever they want to do.

What we are really doing here, and the only thing that we are really doing here, is preventing the things that you say that historically you have done and that you want to do. And in the process of doing that, what you are really accomplishing is to make the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress an inferior body not able to legislate in the same manner as the Senate of the United States, not able to do the same kinds of things that our Senate colleagues can do.

That, in total, is the sum of what you will accomplish.

I think the question that we have to ask ourselves is: Is that the kind of thing that intelligent legislators would want to do to the body of which they are a Member? And I think the answer to that question clearly ought to be no.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) has been consumed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT).

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, there is not anything sinister in this proposed change. The purpose, rather, is to reclaim for the House the historic process of authorizing legislation through authorization bills.

Several things in recent years have conspired to disrupt and undermine the normal authorizing process of the Congress. One of those things has been the budget and reconciliation process which has consumed more and more time and has included in its rec-

onciliation bill more and more matters which normally had been reserved to the authorizing committees of the Congress.

A second thing which has conspired to undermine the authorizing process is this growing temptation to legislate under the guise of limitations on appropriations bills rather than doing it at the time that the authorizing bill is before the House.

The third thing which has conspired to disrupt and undermine our normal authorizing process of legislation has been the growing tendency to lump together at the end of a session a great many authorizations into a continuing resolution.

Now, all this proposal does is to try to reclaim a bit of the historic prerogatives of the authorizing committees of the Congress and a bit of the orderly process which once attended the Congress.

In order that you may understand the way in which this device of offering riders in the guise of limitations has grown, let me offer you these figures: In 1970 there was only one limitation rider adopted to an appropriation bill, only one in all of 1970. In 1980, there were 50. The number of such riders offered as amendments grew from 13 in the entire year 1970 to 67 in 1980. Those adopted grew from 1 to 50.

It got to the point where we were consuming approximately 3 weeks, if you add up all of the debate time that was used, sometimes repetitiously—11 different votes, for example, on abortion amendments, and each of them consuming several hours—if you add up all of the time that was consumed in these temptatious flights of legislation in the nature of limitations, you came to about 3 weeks of the normal legislative year. Now, when you add that into the time that automatically must be consumed if we are to meet our scheduled appropriations bills, then you have further exacerbated the problem which leads to time running out on a session before the regular bills have been considered.

That is the reason we bring this proposed change. It does not gag anybody. It permits the Members, any time they want to debate and vote upon a limitation, to have that opportunity. It gives to any Member who wishes to offer such a limitation which otherwise would be in order full and ample opportunity to strike the last word and advise the Members of his intention so to do. It gives the majority, any time it desires, the right to vote down any motion to rise in order that they may have the privilege of discussing and voting upon any such limitation. If Members want to debate and vote 11 different times on abortion riders for example, they may. If they might perhaps feel it was suffi-

cient to vote on the very same language only four times, they may let it go at that.

So it does not do violence to the majority. All it does is to protect the majority of the Members against the enthronement of some minority, some willful group who otherwise would inflict upon the majority their willful desire to spend the majority's time debating ad infinitum those things which may have been debated over and over again.

So we suggest to you there is nothing profound, there is nothing which wrenches away from any Member rights that he or she otherwise would possess.

We want to suggest one other thing, and this is that, according to the best advice I can gain, ours is the only legislative body in the world in which on appropriations bills it is not otherwise in order to move the previous question on the bill.

□ 1450

So this simply gives to the Congress of the United States what amounts to that power, if the Members desire at the conclusion of the offering of all amendments either to raise money or to lower, to delete or to add money, not further to consider limitations, they may have that option.

● Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the proposed rules which would undermine the ability of Members of the people's body—the House of Representatives—to determine national priorities and policies.

While I am pleased that the original Democratic Caucus proposal to raise the required number of signatures on discharge petitions from 218 to 290 has been dropped, I am still very disturbed by the undemocratic proposal to severely limit the ability of Members to offer limitation amendments to appropriation bills on the House floor. This provision threatens the capacity of Members to exercise oversight of the expenditure of public funds. Perhaps more importantly, this proposed system would shield Members from public scrutiny by allowing them to duck votes on controversial issues. At a time when the public is crying out for greater accountability on the part of public officials, this proposed change is unconscionable.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to remember that appropriations riders have been a valuable legislative tool of both liberals and conservatives. The first anti-Vietnam war measures were appropriations riders. Just last month, a rider on the defense appropriations bill limited the administration's spending for the so-called secret war against Nicaragua's leftist government. In recent years, such amendments have also dealt with controversial issues like abortion, school prayer, and busing.

Mr. Speaker, during debate on the Legislative Reform Act of 1970, you made some very eloquent remarks in favor of an open, honest, and accountable legislative process. I recommend that my colleagues give serious consideration to the following statements as we ponder these drastic changes in our democratic system:

Often the most important parts of a bill—and usually the most controversial sections—are decided upon in amendment form.

In this day and age I believe the people are entitled to know how we vote on legislation, not just on the entire bill, but on the all-important amendments.

Votes on final passage, on previous questions, on recommitment, are only part of the record . . . The whole truth means that we must have a record on amendment votes.

There should be no one among us who is not willing to go on record on the vital issues of the day.

Mr. Chairman, let me say this to you: That the trivial things of today are the important things of tomorrow. I do not think it is right that we should not have an opportunity to record votes on amendments . . .

We are primarily and most importantly legislators. And if the work of legislation can be done shrouded in secrecy and hidden from the public, then we are eroding the confidence of the public in ourselves and in our institutions.

I believe the public is entitled to know how I vote on the issues and I constantly report to them and tell them how I vote.

How many times in history has the statement of Wilson been repeated that the Congress in committee is the Congress at work. The work is done in committee, where it is done under committee rule, and under those rules the public doesn't know where we stand. It is not fair to the people of America.—the Honorable THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 27, 1970, pp. 25796, 25797, and 25805.

In a Democratic study group special report on "The Appropriation Rider Controversy," February 14, 1978, special note is made about the impact of your important legislation. The DSG report stated:

The increase in the number of limitations offered and agreed to is a reflection of the record teller vote reform which took effect in 1971 and of congressional assertiveness in exercising control over Federal expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, it would indeed be ironic if the positive reforms that you played such a vital role in passing, back in 1970, were wiped out by the membership of the House today.

Another interesting point that was made in the 1978 Democratic study group special report was that the sponsorship of limitation amendments seemed to relate to which party controlled the White House. During the Nixon-Ford years, Democrats offered nearly 60 percent of limitations amendments, the report pointed out. On the other hand, Republicans offered nearly 80 percent of limitation amendments during the Kennedy-Johnson years.

Obviously, a virtual ban on appropriations riders would increase the power of the executive branch vis-a-vis the Congress, as the power to keep the executive branch from spending authorized funds in a manner that Congress deemed to be inappropriate would be limited.

We should also consider that a House ban on limitation riders would increase the power of the Senate vis-a-vis the House, as the Senate would retain its power to impose limitations on appropriations. The House would have to acquiesce in or reject the Senate's decision; it could not initiate one of its own.

Mr. Speaker, the 1978 DSG report also pointed out that the right of the House not to appropriate for a purpose, even if that purpose is authorized in law, has been considered a fundamental part of the appropriation power of the House. The report cited the following rulings of the Chair to illustrate this point:

1896—The House in Committee of the Whole has the right to refuse to appropriate for any object it may deem improper, although that object may be authorized by law. . . . That principle of limitation has been sustained so repeatedly that it may be regarded as part of the parliamentary law of the Committee of the Whole.

1904—A mere limitation of the appropriation is in order. There is no obligation on the House to appropriate at all, and therefore it may provide that the money appropriated by it shall not be used in any except such manner as may be specified in the bill. No law is changed because there is no obligation to expend the money at all.

1923—Since Congress has the right to appropriate, Congress has the right to refuse to appropriate, even though the appropriation is authorized.

1925—It is a well-recognized rule that an appropriation may be made or refused for any authorized purpose. In other words, an appropriation may be made for any, all, or none of the purposes authorized by law, but the appropriation or the refusal to appropriate may not be used as a means of changing existing law.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that some Members of the House leadership are concerned about the fact that certain controversial riders are attached to appropriations bills on a regular basis. But I would suggest that the way to resolve this situation is by bringing legislation to the House floor that would resolve these funding controversies on a permanent basis.

Mr. Speaker, the comments you made on July 27, 1970, in favor of an open, honest, and accountable legislative process were as vital then as they are today. I hope my colleagues will maintain the spirit that prompted your 1970 reforms, and give the American people—through their elected Members of the House of Representatives—some rules they can live with. ●

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 3]

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—390

Addabbo	Dreier	Ireland
Akaka	Duncan	Jacobs
Albosta	Durbin	Jeffords
Alexander	Dymally	Jenkins
Anderson	Dyson	Johnson
Annuzio	Early	Jones (NC)
Anthony	Eckart	Jones (OK)
Applegate	Edgar	Jones (TN)
Aspin	Edwards (AL)	Kaptur
AuCoin	Edwards (CA)	Kasich
Barnard	Emerson	Kastenmeier
Barnes	English	Kazen
Bartlett	Erdreich	Kemp
Bateman	Erlenborn	Kennelly
Bates	Evans (IA)	Kildee
Bedell	Evans (IL)	Kindness
Beilenson	Fascell	Kogovsek
Bennett	Feighan	Kolter
Bereuter	Ferraro	Kostmayer
Berman	Fiedler	Kramer
Bethune	Fields	LaFalce
Bevill	Fish	Lagomarsino
Biaggi	Flippo	Lantos
Bilirakis	Florio	Latta
Billey	Foglietta	Leath
Boehlert	Foley	Lehman (CA)
Boggs	Ford (MI)	Lehman (FL)
Boland	Ford (TN)	Leland
Boner	Forsythe	Lent
Bonior	Fowler	Levin
Bonker	Frank	Levine
Borski	Franklin	Levitas
Boucher	Frenzel	Lewis (CA)
Bouquard	Frost	Lewis (FL)
Boxer	Fuqua	Lipinski
Breaux	Garcia	Livingston
Brooks	Gaydos	Loeffler
Broomfield	Gejdenson	Long (LA)
Brown (CA)	Gekas	Lott
Brown (CO)	Gephardt	Lowery (CA)
Broyhill	Gibbons	Lowry (WA)
Bryant	Gilman	Lujan
Burton (CA)	Gingrich	Luken
Burton (IN)	Glickman	Lundine
Campbell	Gonzalez	Lungren
Carney	Goodling	Mack
Carr	Gore	MacKay
Chappell	Gradison	Madigan
Chappie	Gramm	Markey
Cheney	Gray	Marlenee
Clarke	Green	Martin (IL)
Clay	Gregg	Martin (NY)
Coelho	Guarini	Martinez
Coleman (MO)	Gunderson	Matsui
Coleman (TX)	Hall (IN)	Mavroules
Collins	Hall (OH)	Mazzoli
Conable	Hall, Ralph	McCain
Conte	Hall, Sam	McCandless
Cooper	Hamilton	McCloskey
Corcoran	Hammerschmidt	McCollum
Coughlin	Hance	McCurdy
Courter	Hansen (ID)	McDade
Coyne	Hansen (UT)	McEwen
Craig	Harkin	McGrath
Crane, Daniel	Harrison	McHugh
Crane, Philip	Hartnett	McKernan
Crockett	Hatcher	McKinney
Daniel	Hawkins	Mica
Dannemeyer	Hefner	Michel
Daschle	Hertel	Mikulski
Daub	Hightower	Miller (CA)
Davis	Hiler	Miller (OH)
de la Garza	Holt	Mineta
Dellums	Hopkins	Minish
Derrick	Horton	Moakley
DeWine	Howard	Molinar
Dickinson	Hoyer	Mollohan
Dicks	Hubbard	Montgomery
Dingell	Huckaby	Moody
Donnelly	Hughes	Moore
Dorgan	Hunter	Moorhead
Dowdy	Hutto	Morrison (CT)
Downey	Hyde	Morrison (WA)

Mrazek	Rogers	Sundquist
Murphy	Rostenkowski	Synar
Murtha	Roth	Tallon
Myers	Rowland	Tauke
Natcher	Roybal	Tauzin
Neal	Rudd	Taylor
Nelson	Sabo	Thomas (GA)
Nichols	Savage	Towns
Nielson	Sawyer	Traxler
Nowak	Scheuer	Udall
O'Brien	Schneider	Valentine
Oakar	Schroeder	Vander Jagt
Oberstar	Schulze	Vandergriff
Obey	Schumer	Vento
Olin	Seiberling	Volkmer
Ortiz	Sensenbrenner	Vucanovich
Oxley	Shannon	Walker
Packard	Sharp	Washington
Parrisi	Shaw	Watkins
Pashayan	Shelby	Waxman
Patman	Shumway	Weaver
Patterson	Sikorski	Weber
Paul	Siljander	Weiss
Pease	Simon	Wheat
Penny	Sisisky	Whitehurst
Pepper	Skeen	Whitley
Perkins	Skelton	Whittaker
Petri	Slatery	Whitten
Pickle	Smith (FL)	Williams (MT)
Porter	Smith (IA)	Williams (OH)
Price	Smith (NE)	Wilson
Pritchard	Smith (NJ)	Winn
Quillen	Smith, Denny	Wirth
Rahall	Smith, Robert	Wise
Rangel	Snowe	Wolf
Ratchford	Snyder	Wolpe
Ray	Solomon	Wortley
Regula	Spence	Wright
Reid	Spratt	Wyden
Richardson	St Germain	Wylie
Rinaldo	Staggers	Yates
Ritter	Stangeland	Yatron
Roberts	Stenholm	Young (AK)
Robinson	Stokes	Young (FL)
Rodino	Stratton	Young (MO)
Roe	Studds	Zablocki
Roemer	Stump	Zschau

□ 1510

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 390 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

Without objections further proceedings under the call are dispensed with.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

The SPEAKER. Members who have not taken the oath of office will kindly step to the well.

The Speaker administered the oath of office to the following Members-elect: The Honorable JIM LEACH of Iowa, the Honorable JAMES M. JEFFORDS of Vermont, and the Honorable BILL GREEN of New York.

RULES OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, is it not correct that the question before the House is on ordering the previous question, and that if the previous question is voted down, the minority would have an opportunity for offering a substitute to the resolution?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would recognize the minority for that purpose.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 249, nays 156, answered "present" 1, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 4]

YEAS—249

Addabbo	Flippo	McCloskey
Akaka	Florio	McCurdy
Albosta	Foglietta	McHugh
Alexander	Foley	McNulty
Anderson	Ford (MI)	Mica
Andrews (NC)	Ford (TN)	Mikulski
Andrews (TX)	Fowler	Miller (CA)
Annuzio	Frank	Mineta
Anthony	Frost	Minish
Applegate	Fuqua	Moakley
Aspin	Garcia	Mollohan
AuCoin	Gaydos	Montgomery
Barnard	Gejdenson	Moody
Barnes	Gephardt	Morrison (CT)
Bates	Gibbons	Mrazek
Bedell	Glickman	Murphy
Beilenson	Gonzalez	Murtha
Bennett	Gore	Natcher
Berman	Gray	Neal
Bevill	Guarini	Nelson
Biaggi	Hall (IN)	Nichols
Boggs	Hall (OH)	Nowak
Boland	Hall, Ralph	Oakar
Boner	Hall, Sam	Oberstar
Bonior	Hamilton	Obey
Bonker	Hance	Olin
Borski	Harkin	Ortiz
Bosco	Harrison	Patman
Boucher	Hatcher	Patterson
Bouquard	Hawkins	Pease
Boxer	Hefner	Penny
Breaux	Hertel	Pepper
Brooks	Hightower	Perkins
Brown (CA)	Howard	Pickle
Bryant	Hoyer	Price
Burton (CA)	Hubbard	Rahall
Byron	Huckaby	Rangel
Carper	Hughes	Ratchford
Carr	Hutto	Ray
Chappell	Ireland	Reid
Clarke	Jenkins	Richardson
Clay	Jones (NC)	Rodino
Coelho	Jones (OK)	Roe
Coleman (TX)	Jones (TN)	Roemer
Collins	Kaptur	Rose
Coyne	Kastenmeier	Rostenkowski
Crockett	Kazen	Rowland
Daniel	Kennelly	Roybal
Daschle	Kildee	Sabo
de la Garza	Kogovsek	Savage
Dellums	Kolter	Scheuer
Derrick	Kostmayer	Schroeder
Dicks	LaFalce	Schumer
Dingell	Lantos	Seiberling
Donnelly	Leath	Shannon
Dorgan	Lehman (CA)	Sharp
Dowdy	Lehman (FL)	Shelby
Downey	Leland	Sikorski
Durbin	Levin	Simon
Dwyer	Levine	Sisisky
Dymally	Levitas	Skelton
Dyson	Long (LA)	Slatery
Early	Long (MD)	Smith (FL)
Eckart	Lowry (WA)	Smith (IA)
Edgar	Luken	Solarz
Edwards (CA)	Lundine	Spratt
English	MacKay	St Germain
Erdreich	Markey	Staggers
Evans (IL)	Martinez	Stark
Fascell	Matsui	Stenholm
Feighan	Mavroules	Stokes
Ferraro	Mazzoli	Stratton

Studds	Vento	Williams (MT)
Synar	Volkmer	Wilson
Tallon	Walgren	Wirth
Tauzin	Washington	Wise
Thomas (GA)	Watkins	Wolpe
Torres	Waxman	Wright
Towns	Weaver	Wyden
Traxler	Weiss	Yates
Udall	Wheat	Yatron
Valentine	Whitley	Young (MO)
Vandergriff	Whitten	Zablocki

NAYS—156

Bartlett	Hansen (UT)	Pashayan
Bateman	Hartnett	Paul
Bereuter	Hiler	Petri
Bethune	Holt	Porter
Billirakis	Hopkins	Pritchard
Bliley	Horton	Quillen
Boehlert	Hunter	Regula
Broomfield	Hyde	Ridge
Brown (CO)	Jeffords	Rinaldo
Broyhill	Johnson	Ritter
Burton (IN)	Kasich	Roberts
Campbell	Kemp	Robinson
Carney	Kindness	Rogers
Chandler	Kramer	Roth
Chappie	Lagomarsino	Roukema
Cheney	Latta	Rudd
Coleman (MO)	Leach	Sawyer
Conable	Lent	Schneider
Conte	Lewis (CA)	Schulze
Corcoran	Lewis (FL)	Sensenbrenner
Coughlin	Livingston	Shaw
Courter	Loeffler	Shumway
Craig	Lott	Shuster
Crane, Daniel	Lowery (CA)	Siljander
Crane, Philip	Lujan	Skeen
Dannemeyer	Lungren	Smith (NE)
Daub	Mack	Smith (NJ)
Davis	Madigan	Smith, Denny
DeWine	Marlenee	Smith, Robert
Dickinson	Martin (IL)	Snowe
Dreier	Martin (NY)	Snyder
Duncan	McCain	Solomon
Emerson	McCandless	Spence
Erlenborn	McCollum	Stangeland
Evans (IA)	McDade	Stump
Fiedler	McDonald	Sundquist
Fields	McEwen	Tauke
Fish	McGrath	Taylor
Forsythe	McKernan	Vander Jagt
Franklin	McKinney	Vucanovich
Frenzel	Michel	Walker
Gekas	Miller (OH)	Weber
Gilman	Molinari	Whitehurst
Gingrich	Moore	Whittaker
Goodling	Moorhead	Williams (OH)
Gradison	Morrison (WA)	Winn
Graham	Myers	Wolf
Green	Nielson	Wortley
Gregg	O'Brien	Wyllie
Gunderson	Oxley	Young (AK)
Hammerschmidt	Packard	Young (FL)
Hansen (ID)	Parris	Zschau

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Jacobs

NOT VOTING—12

Britt	Edwards (AL)	Owens
Conyers	Lipinski	Pursell
Cooper	Marriott	Swift
Dixon	Mitchell	Torricelli

□ 1530

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MOTION TO COMMIT OFFERED BY MR. MICHEL

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to commit.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to commit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MICHEL moves to commit the resolution, House Resolution 5, to a select committee to be appointed by the Speaker and to be composed of ten members, not more than six of whom shall be from the same political

party, with instructions to report the same back to the House within two legislative days with only the following amendment: Strike clause "(5)" relating to restrictions on the offering of certain amendments to appropriations bills, and redesignate succeeding clauses accordingly.

Mr. MICHEL (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object just to give the membership an opportunity to hear an explanation by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) as to exactly what his motion to commit does.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. Let me say to the gentleman what I would propose to do is to commit this resolution and substitute, in a sense, for our own resolution which would incorporate all of the rules changes proposed by the majority save resolution change No. 5 that would prohibit riders on appropriation bills.

Having earlier, during the discussion and debate on the subject of the rules, discussed very briefly what we would have proposed as a minority party for a package of rules, I would say we are not proposing that package here for your consideration but simply what you have proposed to the House minus that one change on riders on appropriation bills.

So that really in essence is what the motion to commit is all about.

Mr. LOTT. Further reserving the right to object, the gentleman would strictly have a motion to commit the resolution with instructions that it be reported back from a special committee in 2 days, deleting that one provision on appropriations riders. Is that correct?

Mr. MICHEL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois to dispense with reading of the motion?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to commit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to commit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device and there were—yeas 156, nays 250, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]

YEAS—156

Bartlett	Hansen (UT)	Pashayan
Bateman	Hartnett	Paul
Bereuter	Hiler	Petri
Bethune	Holt	Porter
Billirakis	Hopkins	Pritchard
Bliley	Horton	Quillen
Boehlert	Hunter	Regula
Broomfield	Hyde	Ridge
Brown (CO)	Jeffords	Rinaldo
Broyhill	Johnson	Ritter
Burton (IN)	Kasich	Roberts
Campbell	Kemp	Robinson
Carney	Kindness	Rogers
Chandler	Kramer	Roth
Chappie	Lagomarsino	Roukema
Cheney	Latta	Rudd
Coleman (MO)	Leach	Sawyer
Conable	Lent	Schneider
Conte	Lewis (CA)	Schulze
Corcoran	Lewis (FL)	Sensenbrenner
Coughlin	Livingston	Shaw
Courter	Loeffler	Shumway
Craig	Lott	Shuster
Crane, Daniel	Lowery (CA)	Siljander
Crane, Philip	Lujan	Skeen
Dannemeyer	Lungren	Smith (NE)
Daub	Mack	Smith (NJ)
Davis	Madigan	Smith, Denny
DeWine	Marlenee	Smith, Robert
Dickinson	Martin (IL)	Snowe
Dreier	Martin (NY)	Snyder
Duncan	McCain	Solomon
Emerson	McCandless	Spence
Erlenborn	McCollum	Stangeland
Evans (IA)	McDade	Stump
Fiedler	McDonald	Sundquist
Fields	McEwen	Tauke
Fish	McGrath	Taylor
Forsythe	McKernan	Vander Jagt
Franklin	McKinney	Vucanovich
Frenzel	Michel	Walker
Gekas	Miller (OH)	Weber
Gilman	Molinari	Whitehurst
Gingrich	Moore	Whittaker
Goodling	Moorhead	Williams (OH)
Gradison	Morrison (WA)	Winn
Graham	Myers	Wolf
Green	Nielson	Wortley
Gregg	O'Brien	Wyllie
Gunderson	Oxley	Young (AK)
Hammerschmidt	Packard	Young (FL)
Hansen (ID)	Parris	Zschau

NAYS—250

Addabbo	Bryant	English
Akaka	Burton (CA)	Evans (IL)
Albosta	Byron	Fascell
Alexander	Carper	Feighan
Anderson	Carr	Ferraro
Andrews (NC)	Chappell	Flippo
Andrews (TX)	Clarke	Florio
Annuizio	Clay	Foglietta
Anthony	Coelho	Foley
Applegate	Coleman (TX)	Ford (MI)
Aspin	Collins	Ford (TN)
AuCoin	Conyers	Fowler
Barnard	Coyne	Frank
Barnes	Crockett	Frost
Bates	Daniel	Fuqua
Bedell	Daschle	Garcia
Bellenson	de la Garza	Gaydos
Bennett	Dellums	Gejdenson
Berman	Derrick	Gephardt
Bevill	Dicks	Gibbons
Biaggi	Dingell	Glickman
Boggs	Dixon	Gonzalez
Boland	Donnelly	Gore
Boner	Dorgan	Gray
Bonior	Dowdy	Guarini
Bonker	Downey	Hall (IN)
Borski	Durbin	Hall (OH)
Bosco	Dwyer	Hall, Ralph
Boucher	Dymally	Hall, Sam
Bouquard	Dyson	Hamilton
Boxer	Early	Hance
Breaux	Eckart	Harkin
Brooks	Edgar	Harrison
Brown (CA)	Edwards (CA)	Hatcher

Hawkins	Mikulski	Sikorski
Hefner	Miller (CA)	Simon
Hertel	Mineta	Sisisky
Hightower	Minish	Skelton
Howard	Moakley	Slattery
Hoyer	Mollohan	Smith (FL)
Hubbard	Montgomery	Smith (IA)
Huckaby	Morrison (CT)	Solarz
Hughes	Mrazek	Spratt
Hutto	Murphy	St Germain
Ireland	Murtha	Staggers
Jacobs	Natcher	Stark
Jenkins	Neal	Stenholm
Jones (NC)	Nelson	Stokes
Jones (OK)	Nichols	Stratton
Jones (TN)	Nowak	Studds
Kaptur	Oakar	Synar
Kastenmeier	Oberstar	Tallon
Kazen	Obey	Tauzin
Kennelly	Olin	Thomas (GA)
Kildee	Ortiz	Torres
Kogovsek	Patman	Towns
Kolter	Patterson	Traxler
Kostmayer	Pease	Udall
LaFalce	Penny	Valentine
Lantos	Pepper	Vandergriff
Leath	Perkins	Vento
Lehman (CA)	Pickle	Volkmer
Lehman (FL)	Price	Walgren
Leland	Rahall	Washington
Levin	Rangel	Watkins
Levine	Ratchford	Waxman
Levitas	Ray	Weaver
Lipinski	Reid	Weiss
Long (LA)	Rodino	Wheat
Long (MD)	Roe	Whitley
Lowry (WA)	Roemer	Whitten
Luken	Rose	Williams (MT)
Lundine	Rostenkowski	Wilson
MacKay	Rowland	Wirth
Markey	Roybal	Wise
Martinez	Sabo	Wolpe
Matsui	Savage	Wright
Mavroules	Scheuer	Wyden
Mazzoli	Schroeder	Yates
McCloskey	Schumer	Yatron
McCurdy	Seiberling	Young (MO)
McHugh	Shannon	Zablocki
McNulty	Sharp	
Mica	Shelby	

NOT VOTING—12

Britt	Marriott	Pursell
Cooper	Mitchell	Richardson
Edwards (AL)	Moody	Swift
Erdreich	Owens	Torricelli

□ 1550

So the motion to commit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 1. Concurrent Resolution providing for an adjournment of the Senate and the House of Representatives for more than 3 days.

The message also announced that the Senate agreed to the following resolutions:

S. RES. 1

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join such committee as may be

appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

S. RES. 2

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

EQUALIZING PAY FOR FOUR ELECTED OFFICERS

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 6) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 6

Resolved, Until otherwise provided by law, the compensation of the Postmaster of the House of Representatives shall be at a gross per annum rate which is equal to the gross per annum rate of compensation of the Clerk, of the Sergeant at Arms, and of the Doorkeeper, of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN MINORITY EMPLOYEES

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 7) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 7

Resolved, That pursuant to the Legislative Pay Act of 1929, as amended, the six minority employees authorized therein shall be the following named persons, effective January 3, 1983, until otherwise ordered by the House, to-wit: Hyde H. Murray, Walter P. Kennedy, Tommy Lee Winebrenner, Ronald W. Lasch, William R. Pitts, Jr., and Timothy J. Wyngaard, each to receive gross compensation pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 119, Ninety-fifth Congress, as enacted into permanent law by section 115 of Public Law 95-94.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 8) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 8

Resolved, That until otherwise ordered, the hour of meeting of the House shall be 12 o'clock meridian on Mondays and Tuesdays; 3 o'clock post meridian on Wednesdays; 11 o'clock ante meridian on all other days of the week up to and including May 14, 1983; and that from May 15, 1983, until the end of the first session, the hour of daily meeting of the House shall be 12 o'clock meridian on Mondays and Tuesdays and 10 o'clock ante meridian on all other days of the week.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SPEAKER OR DEPUTY TO ADMINISTER OATH OF OFFICE TO THE HONORABLE BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL AT WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 9) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 9

Whereas Benjamin S. Rosenthal, a Representative-elect from the State of New York, from the Seventh District thereof, has been unable from sickness to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Speaker, or deputy named by him, be, and he is hereby, authorized to administer the oath of office to the Honorable Benjamin S. Rosenthal at Washington, District of Columbia, and that the said oath be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said Benjamin S. Rosenthal.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SPEAKER OR DEPUTY TO ADMINISTER OATH OF OFFICE TO THE HON. MARTY RUSSO AT MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 10) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 10

Whereas Marty Russo, a Representative-elect from the State of Illinois, from the Third District thereof, has been unable from illness in the family to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of the

House, and there being no contest or question as to his election: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Speaker, or deputy named by him, be, and he is hereby, authorized to administer the oath of office to the Honorable Marty Russo at Minneapolis, Minnesota, and that said oath be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said Marty Russo.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SPEAKER OR DEPUTY TO ADMINISTER OATH OF OFFICE TO HON. MICKEY EDWARDS AT LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 11) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 11

Whereas Mickey Edwards, a Representative-elect from the State of Oklahoma, from the Fifth District thereof, has been unable from illness in the family to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Speaker, or deputy named by him, be, and he is hereby, authorized to administer the oath of office to the Honorable Mickey Edwards at Los Angeles, California, and that said oath be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said Mickey Edwards.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NATCHER). The Chair announces the Speaker's designation of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTENMEIER) to administer the oath of office to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL).

Pursuant to the authority of House Resolution 10, 98th Congress, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the Honorable HARRY H. MACLAUGHLIN, U.S. district judge, District of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn., to administer the oath of office to Hon. MARTY RUSSO.

Pursuant to the authority of House Resolution 11, 98th Congress, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the Honorable MACLAUGHLIN E. WATERS, U.S. district judge, Central District, Los Angeles, Calif., to administer the oath of office to Hon. MICKEY EDWARDS.

□ 1600

AUTHORIZING CONTINUATION OF INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 12) authorizing continuation of an investigation by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 12

Resolved, That the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct shall continue the inquiry and investigation and related activities authorized by House Resolution 518, Ninety-seventh Congress, agreed to July 13, 1982, in the manner prescribed in such resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY, JANUARY 6, 1983

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourns to meet at 2 o'clock p.m. on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING FUNDS FOR THE STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 13) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 13

Resolved, That (a) for continuance of necessary investigations and studies by—

(1) each standing and select committee established by the Rules of the House; and
(2) each select committee of the House—

(A) which was established by resolution during the Ninety-seventh Congress; and
(B) for which a reestablishing resolution is introduced in the Ninety-eighth Congress; there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House such sums as may be necessary for the period beginning at noon on January 3, 1983 and ending at midnight on March 31, 1983.

(b) Except as provided in subsection (c), each committee referred to in subsection (a) shall be entitled for each month in the period specified in subsection (a) to nine

percent of the total amount made available under expense resolutions for such committee for the second session of the Ninety-seventh Congress.

(c) In order to carry out House Resolution 12, Ninety-eighth Congress, agreed to January 3, 1983, in addition to amounts made available under subsection (b), the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct shall be entitled, for each month in the period specified in subsection (a), to \$50,000 for procurement of consultant services under section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

Sec. 2. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), payments under this resolution shall be made on vouchers authorized by the committee involved, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

(b) Notwithstanding any provision of law, Rule of the House, or other authority, from noon on January 3, 1983, until the election by the House of the committee involved in the Ninety-eighth Congress, payments under this resolution shall be made on vouchers signed by—

(1) the chairman of such committee as constituted at the close of the Ninety-seventh Congress; or

(2) if such chairman is not a Member of the House in the Ninety-eighth Congress, the ranking majority party member of such committee as constituted at the close of the Ninety-seventh Congress who is a Member of the House in the Ninety-eighth Congress.

Sec. 3. The authority of a committee to incur expenses under this resolution shall expire upon agreement by the House to the primary expense resolution for such committee.

Sec. 4. Amounts made available under this resolution shall be expended in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. FRENZEL (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. HAWKINS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, subsection (a)(1) of the first section of the resolution will authorize each standing committee of the House, and the two permanent select committees established in the rules of the House, to expend necessary moneys from the contingent fund until the House is able to adopt primary expense resolutions covering such committees, or until March 31, 1983.

Subsection (a)(2) of the first section of the resolution provides the basis for authorizing the former Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control of the 97th Congress to expend moneys from the contingent fund until the committee is reconstituted and funded by resolution, or until March 31, 1983. The Select Committee has indicated its intention to seek reconstitution, and would qualify under

subsection (a)(2) upon the introduction of a reconstitution resolution.

Subsection (b) of the first section will provide committees, during each of the first 3 months of 1983, with 9 percent of the total authorized during the second session of the 97th Congress. Nine percent per month is equal to the one-twelfth figure we have used in previous funding resolutions, plus the Federal comparability adjustment that the President sent up last October.

Subsection (c) of the first section will provide additional funds to continue the ongoing investigation by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct authorized earlier today.

Section 2 is an administrative provision which governs approval and processing of vouchers. The section provides that a returning Member who served as chairman, or if there is no returning Member who served as chairman, then the next ranking majority party member, be authorized to sign the vouchers and certifications necessary to make payments under the continuing resolution, until such time as a chairman is duly elected for the 98th Congress. This provision is essential to insure the timely payment of routine and continuing expenditures, including January committee payrolls.

Under section 3, the authority under this resolution will expire with the adoption of the primary expense resolution. Any expenditures under the resolution will be debited against the primary expense resolution.

Section 4 requires compliance with the regulations of the Committee on House Administration, and any rules necessary to administer the continuing resolution.

This resolution will maintain the overall status quo with respect to the expenditure of funds by standing and select committees, with the exception of the provision for the Standards Committee investigation.

The resolution clearly served its purpose in the last Congress, and everyone is familiar with the meaning and application of the language.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWKINS. I yield to the ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. FRENZEL. I thank the chairman of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, this is the same resolution we pass every 2 years at this time to keep our committees going. The only unusual item is for consultant services for the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, to fund the resolution which was passed just a few minutes ago. It is standard and should be promptly passed.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HAWKINS. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, your committee appointed on the part of the House to join a like committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled and is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make has performed that duty. The President asked us to report that he will be pleased to deliver his message at 9 p.m. Tuesday, January 25, 1983, to a joint session of the two Houses.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the President also wishes the Members a very happy new year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the committee for reporting on its notification of the President.

JOINT SESSION OF THE CONGRESS—STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 1) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 1

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, January 25, 1983, at 9 o'clock post meridian for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE RECESS ON TUESDAY, JANUARY 25, 1983

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, January 25, 1983, it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time subject to the call of the chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

□ 1610

THE LATE HONORABLE JACK SWIGERT

(Mr. KRAMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, JACK SWIGERT was elected last November to represent Colorado's new Sixth Congressional District, and was to have been sworn in today, along with other Members of the 98th Congress. However, last week Jack lost an heroic battle with bone marrow cancer. It is a tragic loss not only for the House, but also for the Nation. Throughout his life, JACK was an inspiration to those who knew him, as an outstanding college athlete, as a jet test pilot, as the astronaut who successfully piloted the Apollo 13 flight back to Earth after an oxygen tank explosion threatened to scuttle the mission, as staff director for the House Science and Technology Committee and as a successful business executive. I personally believe his greatest achievements were yet to be realized. While his vision will be deeply missed by this body, his courage and pursuit of excellence will serve as a model to us all. This Thursday morning, we have taken out a special order to pay tribute to this outstanding American. Tomorrow, a special plane will take Members to the funeral in Denver and return in the evening. If you would like more information about either the special order or the funeral, please contact my office. Meanwhile, we have put together a resolution which expresses the sorrow of the House regarding JACK's death.

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KRAMER. I yield to my colleague from Colorado.

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, JACK SWIGERT's passing deprives Colorado and the House of Representatives of a man who would have been a truly fine Representative and an able advocate for our State. His experience in national policymaking, particularly his distinguished tenure on the staff of the House Committee on Science and Technology, would have been a credit to this Congress as a whole. JACK's commitment to the people of Colorado was evident throughout the past year, which involved extraordinary personal hardship for him.

In the face of his illness, JACK's courage was an inspiring example to us all. His service in the House certainly would have reflected his outstanding character. Before and since the time JACK piloted a crippled spacecraft and its crew to safety, his life was one of tremendous accomplishment.

I am sure that we all extend our deepest sympathy to JACK's mother and family. We will miss him, and I would hope that all of our Members would join in supporting the resolution offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. KRAMER).

THE LATE HONORABLE JACK SWIGERT

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 14) on the death of the Honorable Jack Swigert, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 14

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable Jack Swigert, a Representative-elect from the State of Colorado.

Resolved, That a committee of five Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the House adjourns today, it adjourn as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF FUNERAL COMMITTEE OF THE LATE HONORABLE JACK SWIGERT

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the funeral committee of the late JACK SWIGERT, the following Members on the part of the House:

Mrs. SCHROEDER of Colorado; Mr. WIRTH of Colorado; Mr. KOGOVSEK of Colorado; Mr. KRAMER of Colorado; and Mr. BROWN of Colorado.

CONSENT OF SENATE TO ADJOURNMENT OF MORE THAN 3 DAYS TO A DAY CERTAIN BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 1) giving the consent of the Senate to an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain by the House of Representatives.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 1

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the Senate adjourns on Monday, January 3, 1983, pursuant to a motion made by the majority leader in accordance with this resolution, it stand adjourned until 12 noon on Tuesday, January 25, 1983.

Sec. 2. That the consent of the Senate is hereby given to an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain by the House of Representatives to begin on Thursday, January 6, 1983 or Friday, January 7, 1983, and terminating on January 25, 1983 at 12:00 noon, pursuant to a motion by the Majority Leader, or his designee.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 40, United States Code, sections 175 and 176, the Chair appoints the gentleman from Texas, Mr. WRIGHT, and the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. MICHEL, as members of the House Office Building Commission to serve with himself.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to make a statement concerning the introduction and reference of bills and resolutions.

As Members are aware, they have the privilege today of introducing bills. Heretofore on the opening day of a new Congress, several hundred bills have been introduced. It will be readily apparent to all Members that it may be a physical impossibility for the Speaker to examine each bill for reference today. The Chair will do his best to refer as many bills as possible, but he will ask the indulgence of Members if he is unable to refer all the bills that may be introduced. Those bills which are not referred and do not appear in the RECORD as of today will be included in the next day's RECORD and printed with a date as of today.

The Chair has advised all officers and employees of the House that are involved in the processing of bills that every bill, resolution, memorial, petition, or other material that is placed in the hopper must bear the signature of a Member. Where a bill or resolution is jointly sponsored, the signature must be that of the Member first named thereon. The bill clerk is instructed to return to the Member any bill which appears in the hopper without an original signature. This procedure was inaugurated in the 92d Congress. It has worked well, and the Chair thinks that it is essential to con-

tinue this practice to insure the integrity of the process by which legislation is introduced in the House.

The Chair also desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him in rule X, clause 5, he will continue the practice of basing sequential referral of bills and resolutions on the subject matter contained in any amendment recommended by the committee or committees first reporting, as well as upon the matter in the original text of the bill or resolution.

The Chair will also exercise his authority in particular situations to designate a primary committee among those to whom a bill may be jointly referred and may impose time limits on committees having a secondary interest following the report of the primary committee.

The Chair intends to use his referral authority in a manner which will maintain the flow of legislation to the floor and thus enhance the ability of the House to complete its legislative schedule within the time limits fixed by law and the rules of this body.

With respect to Senate amendments, the Chair will continue judiciously to exercise his authority including his referral authority under rule XXIV to insure that major new proposals contained in Senate amendments, which are not germane to the original House measure, receive consideration by the committee with subject-matter jurisdiction in the House.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
January 3, 1983.

Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Under Rule III, Clause 4 (Section 647) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I herewith designate Mr. W. Raymond Colley, Deputy Clerk, to sign any and all papers and do all other acts for me under the name of the Clerk of the House which he would be authorized to do by virtue of this designation, except such as are provided by statute, in cases of my temporary absence or disability.

If Mr. Colley should not be able to act in my behalf for any reason, then Mr. Thomas E. Ladd, Assistant to the Clerk, should similarly perform such duties under the same conditions as are authorized by this designation.

These designations shall remain in effect for the 98th Congress or until revoked by me.

Sincerely,

BENJAMIN J. GUTHRIE,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

□ 1620

DEATH BENEFITS FOR FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS AND FIREFIGHTERS KILLED IN THE LINE OF DUTY

(Mr. ANNUNZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to amend the United States Code to provide a lump sum death benefit of \$50,000 for Federal law enforcement officers and firefighters who are killed in the line of duty. The Congress has already provided identical Federal benefits for State and local law enforcement officers and firefighters through the Public Safety Officers Benefits Act of 1976, and my bill simply puts their Federal counterparts under this same coverage.

I can think of no group more deserving of this survivor protection than our Federal law enforcement officers and firefighters. These dedicated men and women risk their lives daily to protect the property, the physical well-being, and the lives of their fellow Americans. When these public servants report to their duty assignments each day, they have no idea what dangers they will face, and whether they will live to see their families. The least we can do is to provide them with the peace of mind of knowing that if they do not survive, our Nation will not turn its back on them, and their dependents will have some financial assistance to carry on alone.

Just a few weeks ago, four FBI agents from my home State of Illinois were killed in a plane crash while they were on official duty trying to recover money from a bank embezzler. Sadly, not only did the Federal Bureau of Investigation lose four outstanding, dedicated agents, more than it has ever lost in a single operation, but also, and more importantly, these agents were all married and left behind a total of 13 young children. It is only right and fair that we extend benefits to the families of these heroic officers, and to all other Federal lawmen and firefighters killed in the line of duty in recent years.

Although Federal men and women have been excluded from the 1976 act because they were eligible for other benefits, these benefits have been eroded by inflation, and have become woefully inadequate for officers with large families to protect. It is time to correct this situation, and this legislation is a small price to pay to the survivors of those who sacrificed their lives so that the property and lives of others might be preserved.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge favorable action on this legislation, which would provide more security and peace of mind for the families of all Federal public safety officers and firemen who

must take risks in the pursuit of a safer society. We must not and cannot, in good conscience, turn our backs on the anguish and poverty suffered by the families of law officers slain while protecting our rights and liberties, and of firemen who die while protecting our lives and our property.

MATH AND SCIENCE EDUCATION: HIGH PRIORITY FOR THE 98TH CONGRESS

(Mr. McCURDY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCURDY. Mr. Speaker, legislation to combat the national crisis in science and math education should be a high priority of the 98th Congress. With America's future hinging on high technology, this issue affects every sector of society and threatens to erode our economic, scientific, and military leadership.

We do not have the science and math teachers to prepare our young people for their roles in a technological world. Fifty percent of the math and science teachers in our classrooms are unqualified. Since 1971, there has been a 77-percent decline in the number of qualified secondary school math teachers and a 65-percent drop in the number of qualified science teachers. We must do something to attract and retain qualified science and math teachers to reverse this dangerous trend toward scientific illiteracy.

During the last Congress, Senator JOHN GLENN and I introduced two bills to increase the present supply of qualified science and math teachers and to insure an adequate supply for the future. This legislation would grant tax credits to high tech firms that hire precollege math and science teachers during the summer or allow their certified employees to teach part-time in the local schools and provide forgivable loans to college students who plan to pursue careers in science and math teaching. These bills directly attack the teacher shortage and I believe they are an integral part of any comprehensive solution to the math and science education crisis. I will be reintroducing these two bills shortly and I urge my colleagues to join me in this initiative which is so vital to our Nation's future.

CONGRESSIONAL SUPPORT FOR ARMS REDUCTION TALKS IN GENEVA

(Mr. BROOMFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing along with SAM STRATTON, BILL CARNEY, and Chairman MEL PRICE, a joint resolution which expresses the support of Congress for

the objectives of the ongoing arms reduction talks in Geneva.

Our negotiators at the START talks are now seriously considering proposals which would reduce nuclear weaponry in both the United States and Soviet arsenals below both current and SALT II levels.

Just recently, Soviet leader Yuri Andropov announced that the Soviets are prepared to reduce their strategic arms by 25 percent.

We stand on the threshold of real progress in Geneva.

Now is the time for Congress and the American people to demonstrate to the Soviets that our negotiators have the solid support of Congress and the American people in their effort to move the world closer to lasting peace.

DISAPPOINTMENT EXPRESSED OVER DEBATE ON FIRST DAY OF SESSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Chair very much for the privilege of addressing the House of Representatives.

I heard with great interest the opening remarks of the Speaker of the House, as well as those of the Republican leader, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL). Both of them made appropriate remarks having to do with the rationale for our being here, namely, the wish and the consent of our constituents. Those appropriate remarks extend to all of us who are Members of the House of Representatives, and I wish to extend those remarks to say that I was most gratified here today to witness that a full one-tenth of 1 percent of my constituency came to Washington to support me, to uphold me as I was taking the oath of office, and to cheer me on as I undertook these responsibilities to which I look forward. They came and participated in almost every kind of event that can be handled for 1 day, including participation in these proceedings, not to mention the social functions which they attended.

But I, in my elation over being here and welcoming them to Washington, as it were, am also gravely disappointed that on their visit to this Chamber they saw a debate and a vote which was just the opposite of what I had been saying throughout the entire campaign. I had touted the House of Representatives and the Congress of the United States as the greatest deliberative body that the world has ever known, and I told my future constituents during that campaign that I would act as vigorously as I could to embellish that debate and to bring it to every household in the 17th District

of Pennsylvania through whatever means might be at my disposal, to espouse their proposals, and to indicate to this Congress what they want to see as changes or to stop certain changes sought to be made by the U.S. Congress. And the first day they come to Congress, the first day I take my seat, my constituents hear a debate which was in the ultimate calculated to cut off and succeeded in cutting off debate in putting through a legislative proposition that will go a long way toward squelching my desire to bring forth legislative proposals truly reflecting the wishes of my constituents who are with me here today in the House of Representatives.

With but that one regret, I ask them to return to their homes and to say to everyone who would hear that their Congressman will do his utmost to best represent their interests.

□ 1630

INTRODUCTION OF THE SOLE SOURCE AQUIFER PROTECTION ACT OF 1983

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CARNEY) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise on the first day of this 98th Congress to introduce legislation which deserves the highest priority not only of me, but of every Member of this body. I wish the record to show that one of my initial acts in my third term as a U.S. Representative for the people of the First District of New York is introduction of the Sole Source Aquifer Protection Act of 1983. The Sole Source Aquifer Protection Act calls for a cooperative Federal, State, and local government approach to preparing and carrying out plans to protect this Nation's ground water.

On Long Island, 2.3 million persons are totally dependent on an underground supply for their drinking water. Nationwide, 90 percent of our rural citizens, and millions in our urban and suburban areas, also depend on aquifers, rather than surface water. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has estimated that the amount of our ground water is 50 times that of our annual flow of surface water. Clearly, protection of such a vast and critical resource is in the best interest of our citizens. But for areas such as Long Island which are without any other source of water, protection of that underground supply takes an even greater importance and urgency.

This bill I present today is offered as an amendment to the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974. That law was due for reauthorization in the last Congress. Instead, this Congress will have to take up its reauthorization and I look forward to the Sole Source Aquifer Protection Act being incorporated

into any rewrite of the safe drinking water law which may emerge from this session.

Development of this measure dates back two Congresses, to December 1980. At that time, I first circulated a draft bill aimed specifically at protecting the Pine Barrens area in the First District which overlies the purest portions of Long Island's aquifer.

In May 1981, the Committee on Science and Technology's Subcommittee on Natural Resources, Agricultural Research and the Environment held hearings on that draft in Southampton, N.Y. The purpose of that legislative hearing was to further seek comments from the public and various experts and agencies on what would be the best legislative approach to protecting that aquifer. As ranking minority member of that subcommittee, I want to again thank our chairman, Mr. SCHEUER, for his help and cooperation with that Southampton hearing.

The bill I submit today grew from those first efforts.

On February 23, 1982, Senator DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN and I introduced this Sole Source Aquifer Protection Act as companion measures in the Senate and House. We were joined by the junior Senator from New York, Mr. D'AMATO, four other members of the Long Island delegation.

Senator MOYNIHAN had been most gracious and cooperative about accepting changes I suggested to the innovative measure he had developed—changes aimed at better protecting the rights and accountability of local government.

I was pleased at the overwhelming support of our bill received at hearings held by the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works in June 1982.

The bill I present today is the same as the companion measure Senator MOYNIHAN and I introduced last year with minor technical changes.

Unfortunately, due to the heavy workload of the House Committee on Energy and Commerce, and because of the priority placed on reauthorizing the Clean Air Act by the chairman of the Health and Environment Subcommittee, my measure was unable to get a formal hearing in this body during 1982.

I am optimistic that in this Congress the Energy and Commerce Committee will take up reauthorization of the Safe Drinking Water Act and consider my bill as an amendment in that larger measure. It is my hope as well that we may see action soon rather than later on this important legislation, and I look forward to working with the committee to assist in any way that I can.

Central to the proposal I am introducing today is a recognition that protection of this great and valuable national resource requires a joint com-

mitment of Federal, State, and local government resources. This proposal, moreover, recognizes the prime role our local governmental units must play in carrying out that protection.

In allowing for cooperative problem solving, and because it assigns an appropriate role to each level of government instead of mandating a federally imposed and enforced solution, I believe this bill is in tune with the philosophy of limited, yet responsible government which the people of this country have increasingly indicated they desire.

Protection of single underground sources of drinking water is clearly a national concern. In addition to the aquifer under Suffolk and Nassau Counties on Long Island, the Environmental Protection Agency has officially designated seven other aquifers as sole sources.

These are: the Edwards Aquifer, Tex.; northern Guam; Fresno County, Calif.; Ten Mile Creek, Md.; Spokane-Rathdrum Valley, Wash.; Biscayne Aquifer, Fla.; and Buried Valley, N.J.

Petitions are pending for 17 other sole-source aquifers. Those are: Cape Cod, Mass.; Kings and Queens Counties (or Brooklyn and the Bronx), N.Y.; Coastal Plain Aquifer, N.J.; Ridgewood, N.J.; Upper Rockaway, N.J.; Erie County, N.Y.; Vestal, N.J.; New Castle County, N.J.; Niagran Aquifer, Wis.; Delaware Basin in New Mexico and Texas; Baton Rouge, La.; Karst Geological Region, Mont.; Helena, Mont.; Santa Cruz Valley, Calif.; Santa Cruz-Avera Alter Aquifer, Ariz.; Whidbey Island and Camano Island, Wash.; and York County-Piedmont Region, Pa.

The Sole Source Aquifer Act of 1983 can provide the necessary framework on which we can build a national policy for these important areas.

At this time, I should like to include for the RECORD a section-by-section analysis of the bill.

SOLE SOURCE AQUIFER PROTECTION ACT— DESCRIPTION OF THE BILL

(A) POLICY

The Federal government shall cooperate with states and municipalities in the preparation and implementation of regional plans for the protection of critical groundwater recharge areas.

(B) FINDINGS

(C) PURPOSES

The purposes of the Act are to: establish procedures for the designation of special protection areas within sole source aquifer regions; develop and implement site-specific comprehensive management plans to protect such critical recharge areas; and establish guidelines for Federal-state cooperation in planning, funding and implementing such management plans.

(D) PETITION FOR DESIGNATION OF SPECIAL PROTECTION AREA

Any one or several municipalities may petition a Governor to apply to EPA for the designation of a "special protection area"

within an area already designated by EPA as a sole source aquifer, pursuant to Sec. 1424(e) of the Safe Drinking Water Act.

The petition must include proposed boundaries and an evaluation of the necessity of such a special designation.

(E) APPROVAL OF PETITION BY THE GOVERNOR

The Governor must approve or disapprove the petition within 180 days.

If the Governor approves the petition, he then proposes his own boundaries for the special protection area and designates a planning entity to develop a comprehensive management plan.

(F) EPA APPROVAL OF PRELIMINARY PETITION

After the Governor submits to the EPA Administrator both the proposed boundaries of the special protection area and the designated planning entity, the Administrator has 60 days in which to approve or disapprove the boundaries and the planning entity based on specific criteria.

Approval by the Administrator qualifies the State for a matching grant (50-50) for the development of the comprehensive management plan.

(G) COMPREHENSIVE MANAGEMENT PLAN

The planning entity shall prepare a comprehensive management plan which is designed to maintain the quality of the groundwater recharged through the special protection area.

The Plan shall include: the evaluation of existing groundwater quality, sources of contamination, recommendations of water quality standards, a detailed map of the area, land use assessment, proposed limits on future private and public development, consideration of land use techniques necessary to protect groundwater quality, proposed areas suitable for public acquisition if necessary, and a program for state and local implementation.

The planning entity shall develop the Plan with as much public participation as possible.

(H) APPROVAL OF THE PLAN BY THE GOVERNOR

The Governor may approve or disapprove the Plan submitted by the planning entity, based on his evaluation of specific criteria.

If necessary, the Governor may designate or establish a separate management entity to implement the Plan.

(I) APPROVAL OF PLAN BY EPA

The EPA Administrator must approve or disapprove the Plan submitted by the Governor within 120 days, based on specific criteria and national defense requirements.

Approval by the Administrator qualifies the State for a matching grant (50-50) for the implementation of certain features of the comprehensive plan but not more than \$20,000,000.

(J) AUTHORIZATION

For planning, \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 1984, fiscal year 1985, and fiscal year 1986.

For implementation, \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 1985, fiscal year 1986 and fiscal year 1987.

(K) DEFINITIONS

SOLE SOURCE AQUIFER PROTECTION ACT— SUMMARY OF THE BILL

The bill sets forth the following procedures for developing and implementing a plan to protect the recharge area of a sole source aquifer:

(1) Petition. A local government submits a petition to the Governor setting forth the proposed boundaries of a "Special Protec-

tion Area" and the rationale for designating such an area in terms of water supply potential.

(2) Governor's approval. The Governor must decide whether or not to pursue the petition. If so, state officials would work with local governments to propose new boundaries, justify the designation, and name a planning authority to be responsible for developing the comprehensive management plan. Then, the Governor submits the petition to the EPA Administrator.

(3) Preliminary EPA approval. If the EPA Administrator determines that the petition meets certain minimum technical requirements and that the planning authority is technically qualified, then the Administrator may approve the petition. An approved petition qualifies the state for matching funds for planning assistance.

(4) Comprehensive plan. The planning authority designated by the Governor has two years to develop a comprehensive management plan. It is required to work closely with all units of government which may be responsible for implementing various parts of the plan.

(5) State approval. The Governor must be able to demonstrate how the State and local governments intend to implement the plan. Thus, agreements must be reached at the local level before the Federal government even considers involvement. Once the Governor approves the comprehensive management plan developed by the planning authority, he submits the Plan to EPA.

(6) EPA approval. The Administrator, will judge the merits of the proposal based on how effectively the Plan would protect the groundwater and how the state proposes to implement the Plan. If the EPA Administrator approves the Plan, then the state is eligible for a matching grant up to \$20 million to implement certain features of the Plan including but not limited to land acquisition.

The Federal government is not responsible for local land use decisions but rather provides technical guidance and consistency in the formulation of regional groundwater protection plans.

A total of \$180 million is authorized over a four-year period.

The "Sole Source Aquifer Protection Act" is an amendment to the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended.

INTRODUCTION OF THE ERA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, today, as the Congress convenes for the 98th time, over 200 Members of this House will cosponsor House Resolution 1, the equal rights amendment.

The ERA has been around for a long time, but the need for this amendment has not diminished. Economic inequalities still exist. The fact remains that women earn 59 cents for every dollar men earn. Civil rights violations on the basis of sex are still occurring. Equality in education as mandated by title IX is not uniformly enforced.

Sure, there have been advances over the past 10 years, but this piecemeal approach—using the legislative process to enact special equal rights laws—

is slow and not comprehensive. An equal rights amendment is needed to correct flaws in State laws and to prevent discrimination at the Federal level.

There should be no misconceptions about the ERA. This amendment does not affect individual lifestyles, but the ERA is simply an economic issue. It relates directly to women's jobs, wages, education, pensions, and social security.

We must, therefore, insure once and for all that "equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex."

This time, let us take the ERA all the way.

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO MAKE THE HECTOR LAND USE AREA A PART OF THE GREEN MOUNTAIN NATIONAL FOREST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HORTON) is recognized for 15 minutes.

● Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the administration is engaged in an effort to identify and sell to private parties Federal land which is surplus to Government use.

I applaud the objective of turning over to the private sector property which can be put to better use by individuals than by the Government. At the same time, however, I believe that Federal land which has substantial value to our citizens because of its Government ownership should not be considered for sale.

One of the parcels of land that falls in this category is the Hector land use area, which is located in Seneca and Schuyler Counties in New York State. As the only U.S. Forest Service presence in New York, Hector offers economic and recreational value to the State's citizens in many times the \$180,000 estimated maintenance cost of the land. Hector is used for grazing and timber. In addition, it is a favorite camping and hiking area for thousands of New York and out-of-State residents each year. The economic values could be altered and the others eliminated if the Federal Government were to sell the land for private use.

As I read the relevant statutes, land like Hector which is part of the national forest system cannot be sold to private persons. However, Agriculture Secretary Block has informed me that he disagrees with my understanding of the law. He states that the Department intends "to study disposal options (for Hector) during fiscal year 1983. . . . a number of options, including . . . sale to the private market, will be considered."

Fortunately, there is one point of law where the Department and I do

agree. We agree on the fact that the Department cannot sell large tracts of land, which are within national forest boundaries, without authorization from Congress.

Hector can therefore be preserved as Federal land without any legal argument if it is simply designated as national forest land. I am today introducing legislation to achieve that objective.

I want to stress that enactment of this measure would result in no cost to the Federal Government. No land purchases are involved. The Hector land use area is now administered by the Forest Service as if it were a unit of the Green Mountain National Forest. My bill simply makes the arrangement formal.

If there is to be any change at all as a result of this legislation, it is altering the name on the signs at the entrances to the Hector area. This is a short bill, basically technical in nature. Its enactment will allow citizens of New York State to continue to enjoy the benefits of this important land use area. ●

THE NATURAL GAS MARKETING IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 1983

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing for the 98th Congress the Natural Gas Marketing Improvements Act of 1983. This bill, first introduced by our now-retired colleague from Ohio, Clarence J. "Bud" Brown, will go a long way toward enabling the interstate natural gas pipelines of this country to reduce the high cost of gas on their systems. It also adds an important dosage of competition to this industry. For the natural gas pipeline industry is like no other: It has been sheltered from the market for so long by pervasive Federal regulation that it has forgotten how to act in harmony with the market. Our natural gas consumers, Mr. Speaker, have suffered as a direct result. This legislation will be of significant help in making sure what is happening today does not have to happen once the legislation is enacted. Once enacted, the cost of natural gas can come down in times of falling demand, just as the market would dictate.

Last Thursday, December 30, 1982, an administrative law judge at the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Judge Levant, issued a most remarkable decision in the Columbia Gas Transmission case. I applaud this decision. When it comes up for review before the full Commission, I ask that its basic holding be affirmed, even if the Commission does make some changes in its text.

In this case, Judge Levant ruled that Columbia pipeline committed a serious

abuse when, in reaction to falling demand on its system for gas, it shut in much of its cheapest supplies but continued to take many of its most expensive supplies. Judge Levant has refused to allow the passthrough of the costs to consumers. Columbia must now make refunds. It will not be easy or quick.

What the judge is saying is that Columbia was engaging in very bad business judgment and, adding insult to injury, using the regulatory provisions of Federal law to pass the high cost of this practice on to consumers, thereby overriding the natural resistance of our consumers, who were switching to other fuels and conserving gas. In other words, Columbia was seeking to use regulation as its industry has come to know it: As a shelter from the market, as a hiding place from its own consumers.

Judge Levant's decision is a firm "no" to this practice. I quote from the decision:

Columbia shall, as of the date of this order, desist from cutting back any less costly supply source before cutting back any more costly supply source to the take-or-pay level and shall establish cutback practices which are consistent with the lowest reasonable rate standard of the Natural Gas Act.

The bill I am introducing today, Mr. Speaker, will provide all interstate pipelines with the very design of "cutback procedures" that Judge Levant has in mind.

What the bill does is to enable pipelines to reduce an oversupply of gas in a way that reduces consumer prices as well. Under present law, a lot of gas contracts have what is called a "take or pay" feature. Take or pay means that a pipeline will pay for a certain volume of gas whether it can sell it or not. My bill would enable pipelines to reduce take-or-pay provisions down to a 50-percent level in times of surplus, starting with their most expensive source and working downward.

It also provides that the gas not taken can be purchased by anyone—another pipeline, an industrial user, or a local distributor. The first pipeline will have to carry the gas to the new buyer but will receive an equitable fee for transporting the gas.

Mr. Speaker, the way the bill is designed can actually increase the pressures on pipelines to become sensitive to the marketability of the price of natural gas. Because the bill requires them to start with their highest price source of gas and work down, this mechanism encourages producers to renegotiate their contracts downward in order to maintain sales.

If, however, a pipeline "shuts in" a producer under this bill, the producer is not left without any recourse. The bill enables the producer to find a second buyer and obligates the first pipeline to transport the gas on his behalf. This is an important quid pro

quo. In addition, the bill was the very first natural gas legislation to propose what has become known as contract carriage compensation. I do not want to go into too much detail but this new idea of allowing pipelines to earn a fair rate of return for simply transporting natural gas without necessarily first having to purchase it and then to resell it offers great promise for the future of this industry.

This bill is important to us, Mr. Speaker, because it gives our local distribution companies the ability, or just the threat, to "vote with their feet." It gives our consumers a competitive edge against irrational pipeline purchasing practices. And, as a market mechanism, it is immediate. It does not depend upon the services of administrative law judges, good as they are, or the FERC. It is competition. And it works.

In an important point, Mr. Speaker, this bill applies to all gas, including imported supplies. So pipelines which have come to rely too heavily upon imported gas priced too highly will be able to reduce their take-or-pay obligations under this proposal. I am, as you know, one Representative very upset at Panhandle's purchase of \$7 plus Algerian gas at a time when the average American producer receives only \$2.50 for the same volume, 1,000 cubic feet. Under this bill, Panhandle can get a handle on that contract. Or, like Columbia under Judge Levant's ruling, it can face the music.

Mr. Speaker, in the many months since my good friend Bud Brown first introduced this bill, many interested parties have suggested certain changes to this text. I do not want anyone to think that I have forgotten this because the original text is being reintroduced verbatim. These suggestions have been duly noted and are on file. But it was important to me to reintroduce the bill today, the very first day of the new Congress. For this reason, I employed the original text.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. ●

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT FOR A 6-YEAR PRESIDENTIAL TERM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Brooks) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, nearly 200 years ago, at the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, our Founding Fathers debated the idea of providing for a chief executive who would serve one single 6-year term. As we know, this proposal was set aside in favor of 4-year terms, with a limit of two such terms placed on our Presidents under the 22d amendment to the Constitution. Events of our recent history have shown that it is time to give

additional consideration to single 6-year Presidential terms.

The stresses and complexities of the office of President of the United States have grown to almost unimaginable proportions in recent times. It is vital that we do everything that we can to make this office as effective as possible and to relieve those pressures that we can. We would all benefit if the occupant of the Oval Office were free to concentrate on running the country instead of running for a second 4-year term.

Mr. Speaker, too often we have seen how distracting and damaging to effective governance the pressures of reelection can be. Our Presidents have been forced to spend the entire year before an election undergoing grueling primary and general election contests, while at the same time attempting to carry out their constitutional responsibilities. I think it is clear that these dual demands have been one source of our failed Presidencies, and may in part account for the fact that no President since Dwight Eisenhower has completed two terms in office.

Mr. Speaker, we must not add to the burdens of the Presidency. The job will call upon the full range of talent and capability of whoever holds the office. A 6-year term will give our Presidents the time they need to carry out their programs. Limiting them to a single 6-year term will allow them to focus on the job they were elected to do—leading the Nation—rather than on the next election.

I hope that the 98th Congress will give serious attention to this proposal. ●

FURTHER INFORMATION ON CONTEMPT CITATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF EPA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEVITAS) is recognized for 10 minutes.

● Mr. LEVITAS. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to keep the Members of this House informed about the proceedings of the contempt citation of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, I am inserting for the RECORD a copy of a letter with enclosures, that I sent on December 29, 1982, to the Honorable PETER W. RODINO, Jr., chairman of the House Judiciary Committee:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., December 29, 1982.
Hon. PETER W. RODINO, Jr.,
Chairman, House Committee on the Judiciary,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In furtherance of our conversations about the contempt citation of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (H. Res. 632) and the response of the Attorney General, I am enclosing a copy of a statement I made on the floor of the House on December 20.

Subsequently, I received a copy of the enclosed letter, dated December 27, 1982 from

the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia addressed to The Speaker concerning the same matter.

In addition to the matter of possible impeachable offenses by the Attorney General and the U.S. Attorney, the question also arises whether a Special Prosecutor should be appointed to handle this case.

The U.S. Attorney's letter clearly spells out his conflict of interest. Furthermore, his conclusion that there is no requirement as to any time (e.g. timely manner) when he is required to present the case to the grand jury under Section 194 of Title 2 USC is obviously an abandonment of his statutory duties since under his interpretation he could take 5 or 10 or 20 years or more to get around to doing his duty. His statement that he recognizes "the likelihood" that he is in disagreement with the House "over the underlying merits of the controversy" further raises questions about his ability or willingness to discharge his statutory responsibilities.

The civil action to which the U.S. Attorney refers is frivolous to begin with, but beyond that, the suit has no preliminary injunctive relief prohibiting the U.S. Attorney or the House from proceeding under 2 USC 194. His startling decision that it would not be "appropriate" to bring the matter before the grand jury while the civil action is pending is simply joining in with the Attorney General's flaunting of the law and reflects a determination by both individuals not to take care that the law is faithfully executed.

Finally, I enclose for your consideration copy of a portion of the transcript of the hearing at which our Subcommittee cited the Administrator for contempt. The pertinent, sworn testimony is that of Assistant Attorney General Ted Olson, who stated, under oath, that the role of the Justice Department in advising the EPA Administrator would not inhibit the Justice Department from carrying out its responsibilities in prosecuting under the Congressional Contempt Statute . . . which is exactly what they have failed and refused to do.

Under the circumstances, I renew my request that your staff consider whether impeachable offenses may have been committed and also whether a Special Prosecutor should be appointed.

Very truly yours,

ELLIOTT H. LEVITAS,
Member of Congress.

[From the Congressional Record, Dec. 20, 1982]

RECENT OFFENSIVE LAWSUIT FILED AS U.S. GOVERNMENT VERSUS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LEVITAS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to update the Members on the Gorsuch contempt of Congress matter that is now in process.

Subsequent to the action of the House last week in citing for contempt the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Justice filed lawsuit unprecedented in the history of this Nation entitled the United States of America versus the House of Representatives of the United States et al. which in and of itself is not only unprecedented, it is obviously offensive by its very name.

This Justice Department suit has been described by Lawrence Tribe, a professor of law at Harvard University, as totally without basis or merit. He accused the Justice Department officials who filed the case with "either abject ignorance of the Constitution

or contemptible cynicism about constitutional separation of powers."

By instructing the U.S. attorney of the District of Columbia not to fulfill his duties to prosecute the contempt as required by the law, the Attorney General of the United States has failed to faithfully execute the law and is engaging, in my judgment, in an obstruction of justice.

I would hope that the Judiciary Committee will take action as promptly as possible to inquire into whether the actions of the U.S. attorney and the Attorney General of the United States constitute impeachable offenses for failing to carry out and faithfully execute the law.

This is a very serious and grave matter raising the most fundamental constitutional questions, Mr. Speaker, and I think that when the highest law officer of this land fails to obey the law, it brings the entire system into discredit and into disrepute.

Accordingly, I would hope that the Judiciary Committee would promptly look into this matter to determine what further action might be taken.

The truth is that what we really want is the information from EPA to proceed with our oversight investigation of the Superfund program to clean up the hundreds of dangerous abandoned hazardous waste dumps. This investigation is our constitutional duty. It affects the health of the American people.

We do not want subpoenas. We do not want contempt citations. We do not want impeachment proceedings. We do not want confrontation. We only want the facts so that we can do our job.

However, the administration seems to want a fight. They have failed to cooperate; failed to respond to a subpoena; and now are failing to faithfully execute the law. That is our only way to get the facts. We must go forward.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, U.S.
ATTORNEY, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,

Washington, D.C., December 27, 1982.

Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER. This is in response to your communication of December 17, 1982, certifying to me House Resolution 632 regarding the production of documents by The Honorable Anne M. Gorsuch, Administrator of the United States Environmental Protection Agency.

On December 16, 1982, Civil Action Number 82-3583 was filed by the Department of Justice in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. In that case, the Department seeks to have the District Court declare that the compelled production of the documents sought by the House of Representatives unconstitutionally would contravene important separation of powers principles, and that the subpoena issued for those documents is constitutionally defective. Pursuant to Section 547 of Title 28, United States Code, I am responsible within this district for prosecuting, for the Government, all civil actions, suits, or proceedings in which the United States is concerned. Accordingly, although the principal work in the pending case is being done by the Civil Division of the Department of Justice, I nonetheless am in the posture of being legally responsible for the prosecution of that civil action for the Government.

Under the same statutory section, I also am responsible for prosecuting, within this

district, all offenses against the United States. As part of the discretion which I must exercise as the chief prosecuting officer of this district, a determination must be made as to when a matter should be submitted to a grand jury.

I am keenly aware of the provisions of Section 194 of Title 2, United States Code. It should be noted that that section of the Code quite properly does not include a mandate as to the timing of submitting a matter to a grand jury.

I recognize the degree of interest which you and your colleagues have in this proceeding. Accordingly, as a matter of courtesy I wish to advise you that I have concluded that it would not be appropriate for me to consider bringing this matter before a grand jury until the civil action has been resolved. While I recognize the likelihood that we are in disagreement over the underlying merits of the controversy, we do have a common interest—namely, achieving a resolution of the disputed questions as expeditiously as possible and with a minimum of adverse consequences to good government and to the country as a whole. Accordingly, I urge that you pursue with us the use of the pending civil suit as the most effective medium in which to advance the judicial resolution of the controversy.

You may be assured of my continuing and careful attention to this matter.

Respectfully,

STANLEY S. HARRIS,
U.S. Attorney,
District of Columbia.

Mr. LEVITAS. Also, I want to direct this to the representative from the Justice Department, Mr. Olson.

Mr. OLSON. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LEVITAS. Since I am going to ask you a question, I am required that I administer the oath to you for your response, if you would.

[Witness sworn.]

Mr. LEVITAS. Thank you, Mr. Olson.

Let me just ask you this question again. It is preliminary in nature. I don't want to get down the line and see if there is any problem. As you are aware, these proceedings may, as a matter of law, hopefully not but may lead to prosecution under the congressional intent statute. I am trying to inquire whether it is the Department of Justice's position that you may furnish information to Mrs. Gorsuch notwithstanding the fact that later prosecution for contempt may result from these proceedings and that furnishing such representation will neither inhibit nor prevent the department from carrying out its statutory responsibilities.

Mr. OLSON. This is not the appropriate time for the Attorney General or Department of Justice to make a determination as to who might represent an individual in a particular case or what particular case may be prosecuted under circumstances that have not yet developed, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LEVITAS. Therefore, it is your position, as I understand it, that the fact that you have advised Mrs. Gorsuch, as I understand it, concerning this matter and the Attorney General has, and your participation in these proceedings today, would not prevent the Justice Department from discharging its statutory responsibilities under the congressional contempt statute if that should, which we hope it will not, eventuate?

Mr. OLSON. We do not believe that anything we have done to date or intend to do at this hearing would jeopardize the ability of the Attorney General to discharge his re-

sponsibilities under the Constitution and laws of the United States.●

BANKRUPTCY COURT ACT OF 1983

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a bill to resolve the constitutional crisis created in the bankruptcy courts by the inaction of the 97th Congress and the denial by the Supreme Court of the application of the Solicitor General of the United States for an extension of the stay granted by the Court in the Northern Pipeline Construction Co. against Marathon Pipe Line Co.

Congress inaction undermines respect for the law by blatantly ignoring a constitutional mandate handed down by the highest court in the land.

I believe resolution of the constitutional problem in the bankruptcy court system needs to be the first legislative item on the agenda of the Judiciary Committee in the 98th Congress and, for that reason, I am introducing legislation which solves the problem with the least cost and with the least change and displacement in the present system. This bill simply provides that U.S. bankruptcy judges be appointed by the President during good behavior, rather than for 14 year terms as is the case under the existing law.

This bill does not create a new court, does not authorize additional numbers of judges or personnel, and does not in any way alter the jurisdiction of the bankruptcy courts, which encompasses only bankruptcy and bankruptcy-related cases as under present law.

Article III bankruptcy judges would receive an annual salary of \$65,000. The current salary of a bankruptcy judge is \$58,500. It is important that the level of salary be raised slightly in order to attract article III bankruptcy judges of the highest caliber and qualifications, particularly experienced, midcareer practitioners from the private sector.

Somewhat improved retirement benefits are provided under the bill to former bankruptcy judges who are not appointed to the article III court provided that they meet certain service qualifications and provided that they remain on the bench during the transition to the article III bankruptcy court. It is important that there be a smooth and orderly transition to the article III court system and that can only occur, particularly under the current workload, if experienced judges remain on the bench for the transition period. These retirement provisions provide an incentive for bankruptcy judges—particularly many who may not be appointed solely for political

reasons—to continue to serve during the transition period.

The retirement provisions of the bill are less generous than those contained in H.R. 6978 as it was reported by the committee last year. Qualifying transition judges would receive retirement pay at a rate equal to 2½ percent of average pay times years of service, never to exceed 80 percent of salary.

There are several other amendments to the bill as it is being introduced today from the version that was reported by the Judiciary Committee last year. The bill provides that bankruptcy judges cannot be even temporarily assigned to the district or circuit court. Article III bankruptcy judges are not authorized to hear any non-bankruptcy related case.

One of the major reasons for the separate bankruptcy court, which has long been in existence, is the need for expedition in bankruptcy cases. While all litigation should be expeditiously terminated, by the nature of bankruptcy, assets are deteriorating in value. In a liquidation case, the faster a case is terminated the more creditors will receive. In a reorganization case, speed is absolutely essential if there is to be any chance for a successful reorganization. If bankruptcy judges are authorized to sit on nonbankruptcy cases, there is a real danger that they will be assigned to criminal cases because of Speedy Trial Act considerations or used to clear up the large civil case backlog in the district courts. If these matters took precedence over bankruptcy cases there would not be any effective bankruptcy law—since speed is critical.

This bill also provides that the appointment of the 227 article III bankruptcy judges authorized under the bill be staggered over a 3-year period—from 1983 to 1985—to provide sufficient time to search for and confirm qualified candidates. It would be very difficult to process this number of judges in a shorter time period.

I cannot overemphasize the importance of passage of this bill to the continued efficient functioning of the Nation's bankruptcy system. I think we can all agree that a major disruption of this system in the present difficult economic period is highly undesirable.

The Judiciary Committee has spent many hours over many years examining this problem, consulting constitutional scholars, and bankruptcy experts and reviewing possible alternatives. In light of the reasoning and holding of the Northern Pipeline decision, the importance of expedition in bankruptcy cases, and the present workload of the Federal district courts, we have always concluded that an article III bankruptcy court is the simplest, least expensive, and most workable solution to the constitutional problem.●

● Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be joining with Mr. RODINO today in sponsoring legislation which will lift our bankruptcy court system from its present state of disruption and distress and place it on the firm constitutional basis required by the Supreme Court in the Marathon Pipe Line decision handed down on June 28, 1982. This bill is the first legislation I have sponsored in this Congress and it assuredly will be among my highest priorities until enacted into law. It should be among the highest priorities of every Member of this body.

In its closing hours, the 97th Congress failed to act on a similar bill, although we all knew then that the Supreme Court's stay of its judgment in the Marathon case would expire on Christmas Eve, and we were repeatedly warned of the consequences of our failure to act. Now those consequences are upon us. With the withdrawal of jurisdiction from the bankruptcy courts, over 700,000 pending cases have gone into the district courts, cases which the district courts are manifestly incapable of handling themselves.

I recognize that the judicial conference has prepared a model rule under which the bankruptcy courts would be assigned the district courts' jurisdiction over cases arising under title II or related thereto. There would be de novo review by the district court of any proposed judgment in a title 11-related case or when constitutionally required, which is left undefined. But in the words of Assistant Attorney General Jonathan Rose of the Department of Justice, with which I am in agreement, "the Judicial Conference cannot do by rule what the Supreme Court said Congress can't do by statute."

Mr. Speaker, since December 24 our system of bankruptcy adjudication has been clouded with uncertainty. The clouds will become quite visible now that the holiday season is over. It will be especially difficult to proceed with any large commercial bankruptcies or reorganizations where debtors, creditors, and purchasers of assets must be able to rely on the validity of the bankruptcy court's orders. Such disruption of our bankruptcy courts must ultimately result in the loss of millions of dollars and thousands of jobs, as reorganizations of our Nation's productive resources are delayed by legal uncertainties. Every Member of this body is deeply concerned about unemployment and the state of our economy. It should be each Member's responsibility, therefore, to support legislation which places the bankruptcy courts on a sound article III basis, so their work can go forward efficiently and expeditiously.

The bill I am cosponsoring today is substantially that which the Judiciary Committee reported just 7 weeks after the Marathon decision was handed

down. It establishes the bankruptcy court as an independent court where judges will be guaranteed life tenure and protection against salary diminution, the constitutional infirmities found in the Marathon case. A total of 227 bankruptcy judges would be appointed, one-third in each of the next 3 years. This will give both the present incumbent in the White House and whoever is elected in 1984 a fair number of appointments. Such judges would not be "fungible" or assignable to hear cases other than those in bankruptcy. They would hear only cases arising under title 11 of the United States Code or related thereto. This is identical with their jurisdiction under the Bankruptcy Reform Act of 1978. Presently serving judges who are not reappointed and who meet other qualifications would receive retirement benefits calculated in conformity with the congressional retirement program—and no more than that.

Mr. Speaker, as I am certain many Members have already heard and will be hearing from their constituents and other business interests in the days and the weeks ahead, that this is essential legislation. Although there are other bankruptcy matters which need to be addressed, I firmly believe that it is our collective responsibility to concentrate on the constitutional issue until it is fully and finally resolved.●

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks, and to include therein extraneous matter, on the subject of the special order speech today by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. NATCHER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

INTRODUCTION OF NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT INVESTMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced the National Development Investment Act, and finish-up program for the Appalachian Regional Commission. The bill is identical to H.R. 6100, which was cosponsored by 84 Members during the 97th Congress, and which passed the House last August by a vote of 281 to 95. Unfortunately, the Senate did not act on the bill in the last Congress, but we hope they will agree to give the bill their fair attention early this year, as a priority issue.

I introduce it today to emphasize the concern of the Public Works and Transportation Subcommittee on Economic Development for the disastrous economic situation we face, and for the overwhelming number of unemployed Americans who face a future of little hope.

This is not a make-work "jobs" bill. It is not a short term or miracle cure for the nationwide recession. It is a program for stable, long term, sustained economic growth, and permanent, private sector job creation.

It will lay the groundwork for economic recovery at the local level. This Nation's economic strength has always been measured by the soundness of the sum of its parts. This bill addresses the most distressed of those parts, our hardest-pressed communities. It is a "percolate-up" approach to economic recovery rather than the discredited "trickle down" from the national economy approach. If we care about this Nation as a whole, we must care about its communities and its people.

Title I of this bill, the National Development Investment Act, would establish a successor agency to the Economic Development Administration (EDA). The programs are grants for public capital facilities, loans to small businesses, and technical assistance and planning; they are similar to those existing under EDA. The recipients will be the States, economic development districts, units of local government, and Indian tribes would remain eligible for assistance under the new act. In addition, the new bill also would reach, for the first time, pockets of distress in otherwise prosperous areas.

But we made changes in the program to meet the challenges of the 1980's, and to institute improvements in the present program based on our 20 years of experience writing economic development legislation.

First, we tightened the eligibility requirements. By limiting eligibility to areas with 1 percent above the national unemployment level over the past 2 years, and to areas with a per capita income of 80 percent or less of the national average, we were able to reduce eligibility to truly distressed areas. Under this bill, 41 percent of the Nation's population would be eligible, as opposed to the current 80 percent.

Of course, areas whose major employer has, or is about to close its doors, or which are stricken with other sudden and severe economic dislocations, would remain eligible.

We also changed eligibility procedures. Previously, once an area was designated as distressed, it remained eligible. Under the new legislation, an area must demonstrate distress with every application.

Third, we adopted the application procedures to reflect the real process

of economic development. Applicants must, prior to receiving a grant, draw up a comprehensive development investment strategy into which the applied-for project must fit. Gone is the projects-for-projects-sake approach of the past. Each project would, under our legislation, have to be integrally linked to the area's overall economic problems, and contribute to a comprehensive solution to those problems.

Under the new bill, the Federal matching share would be limited to 50 percent of the project cost, and there would have to be major involvement by the private sector.

The bill includes grants for revolving loan funds, to be administered locally, to make loans to small businesses.

It authorizes \$425 million a year for development facilities grants, and \$75 million a year for planning. It is a 3-year bill.

Title II of our bill would put into legislative language the finish-up program proposed by the Appalachian Governors for the Appalachian Regional Commission. ARC Chairman Gov. John Y. Brown of Kentucky testified to the need for this finish-up program at our hearings in Huntington, W. Va. This is a modest and pragmatic plan of action to sustain economic recovery and continue the already well-begun ascension of the Appalachian region toward national economic standards.

The bill provides a 3- to 5-year finish-up for the nonhighway programs of ARC with declining authorizations; \$83 million annually for 1984 through 1986, and \$75 million for 1987 and 1988. It reduces the maximum nonhighway grant from 80 to 50 percent.

Under the highway program, the bill directs funding of the priority highway routes and accelerates construction of the Appalachian highway system to be completed by 1991. We authorize \$215 million for the first year of the highway program.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation focuses on the needs of the 1980's: On private sector jobs, on small business, which studies have shown to be the major source of jobs; and on repair and rehabilitation of the Nation's deteriorating infrastructure, as well as on construction of new buildings, facilities, and other public capital, that may be required.

It is a good bill, a sound bill, and a needed bill. While we do not pretend it will solve the National economy's problems, it does address the economic problems of communities, where it can make a real change for the better.

The Subcommittee on Economic Development plans hearings in the near future and will report the bill to the House by May. We hope to send it to the Senate as soon as possible thereafter and hope even more urgently that

this year the other body will act favorably on it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add, here, a brief summary of the bill:

THE NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT INVESTMENT ACT—HOW THE PROGRAM WILL WORK ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

Three distress criteria to determine eligibility:

- (1) Unemployment: 1 percent above national average, previous 24 months.
- (2) Per capita income: 80 percent of national average, using latest available statistics.
- (3) Anticipated sudden rise in unemployment: imminent plant closing, military base loss, etc.

Only one of the above required to qualify. Eligibility and grandfathering in current EDA law repealed.

DEVELOPMENT INVESTMENT STRATEGY

Cities and counties under 50,000: work with Economic Development District or state economic development agency to devise investment strategy.

Cities and counties over 50,000 or pockets of distress within city: do their own planning.

Strategy, in 20 pages or less, includes: Inventory of community's resources, industries, businesses, infrastructure available and needed, workforce: skills available, land availability, a showing that nonfederal 50 percent matching funds are available, a showing that private sector is willing to invest, and description of industry/business to be created or expanded.

Description of specific ventures to be funded; e.g.: Revolving loan fund, Employee Stock Ownership Plan, and grant for infrastructure.

FUNDING

Strategy implementation: authorizes \$425 million annually for 3 fiscal years.

Planning and strategy development: authorizes \$75 million annually for 3 fiscal years.

These are grant, not loan, funds.

APPLICATION PROCEDURE

Submitted to Secretary of Commerce.

Secretary reviews application to determine that: It meets distress criteria; the strategy has a good chance of working.

Secretary approves/rejects project.

Best strategies are to be approved—those with best chance for success.

LIMITATIONS

\$2 million limit on federal funds per strategy. Revolving Loan Fund limited to \$1 million.

Subsequent applications must requalify on new showing of distress. ●

THE NONDISCRIMINATION IN INSURANCE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I invite all Members of the House to cosponsor the bill—H.R. 100, the Nondiscrimination in Insurance Act—which I have introduced on this first day of the 98th Congress. It is similar to the bills—H.R. 100 and S. 2204—sponsored in the previous 97th Congress by well over 100 Members of the House and by almost one-fourth of the Senators, and

reported favorably by the Senate Commerce Committee just before the 97th Congress ended.

This bill has one single, simple, narrow, objective—to eliminate discrimination, on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin, in insurance and annuities. It prohibits such discrimination in all phases of insurance and annuities—in access and availability of coverage and underwriting; in the terms, conditions, rates, benefits, and requirements of the insurance and annuity contracts; and in the methods for determining them. It would not do anything else. It would not in any other way interfere with any State's power to regulate the insurance industry. It would not affect any other type of action by any insurance company.

This bill is patterned after three major laws which are now in the United States Code, namely:

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits such discrimination in employment;

Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, which prohibits such discrimination in housing; and

The Equal Credit Opportunity Act, which prohibits such discrimination in consumer credit and finance.

Like the employment and housing antidiscrimination laws, this bill will place primary jurisdiction in the States to deal with such discrimination in insurance and annuities. Thus, the bill specifically provides that any complaint that an insurer has committed an unlawful discriminatory act—that is, based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin—must first be filed with the appropriate State agency, if the State has a law prohibiting such discrimination and an agency to administer and enforce that State law. Only if the State has no such law or agency, or fails to resolve it to the complainant's satisfaction, will this bill allow the complainant to seek the next remedy; namely, to file a judicial action in a State or Federal court. The availability of that judicial remedy of course, will encourage the enactment of State laws prohibiting such discrimination. It will also help make the administration of the State law more effective, because the State can then proceed to eliminate discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin, without any fear that such action may result in insurance companies or their contracts moving to another State which allows such discrimination.

REASONS FOR ENACTING THIS BILL

The principle of prohibiting discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin is now part of our fundamental law and doctrine. We have made great strides toward making that principle into living reality—in employment, public accommo-

dations, housing, credit, government regulation and government benefits, transportation, recreation, voting, education, athletics, and many other areas of life.

But one of the greatest remaining gaps is in insurance and annuities. Blacks are heavily discriminated against in property, accident, casualty, and health insurance, and more subtly in other forms of insurance. Sex discrimination is blatant and widespread. These discriminations have widespread impact on millions of people. Our national policy of ending discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin demands that such discrimination in insurance and annuities also be ended.

This bill will not harm the insurance industry. It will help to protect consumers, business, poor people, widows, widowers, orphans, elderly people and retirees, and others. It will not intrude on the ability or powers of any State, which complies with the nondiscrimination principle, to regulate the insurance industry. Most defined-benefit pension and annuity plans, and much of the group forms of insurance, already operate without such discrimination. Several Federal courts, including the Supreme Court of the United States, have already ruled that sex discrimination in pension plans violates title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. But many insurance companies still engage in such discrimination in their annuity plans. This bill will eliminate that disparity between the requirements of title VII as now applied by the courts in employment-related plans, and the industry's discriminatory practices, and will thus prevent possible frustration of title VII's nondiscrimination mandate. It is a bill whose enactment is long overdue.

This legislation is supported by a wide-ranging multitude of representative groups, organizations and individuals of the American public. For example, the report issued by the Senate Commerce Committee last month listed the following organizations as having specifically endorsed the bill:

A.F.L.-C.I.O., American Association of Retired Persons, American Association of University Professors, American Association of University Women, American Civil Liberties Union, American Home Economics Association, American Nurses Association, American Veterans Committee, Inc., Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, Center for National Policy Review, Coal Employment Project, Displaced Homemakers Network, Inc., Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A., Leadership Conference on Civil Rights.

Mexican-American Legal Defense Fund, N.A.A.C.P., National Association of Farmworkers Organizations, National Association of Social Workers, National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice, National Community Action Agency Directors Association, National Conference of Black Mayors, Inc., National Consumers League, National Council of Jewish Women, Nation-

al Council of Negro Women, National Council of Senior Citizens, National Federation of Business and Professional Womens Clubs, National Ladies Auxiliary of the Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A., National Insurance Consumer Organization, National Organization for Women (N.O.W.).

National Urban League, National Women's Party, National Women's Health Network, National Women's Political Caucus, Office of Legislative Affairs, Women's Div., General Board of Global Ministries, United Methodist Church, Older Women's League, Organization of Chinese Americans, Rural American Women, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (U.A.W.), U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Washington Office, Episcopal Church, Women's Equity Action League (W.E.A.L.), Women's Law Project, Women's Legal Defense Fund, Women, U.S.A.

Several of the trade associations representing much of the insurance industry have opposed this legislation because it would ban the industry's widespread practices of sex discrimination in insurance and annuities. Yet the representatives of these trade associations acknowledge that discrimination based on race, color, religion, or national origin is improper and unjust and should not be countenanced. Furthermore, their arguments for the continuation of sex discrimination do not reflect a uniform view. Indeed, the vast majority—over 95 percent—of employees, both in government and in private industry, are covered in connection with their employment, by defined-benefit annuity pension plans which provide periodic benefits in single life annuities and/or by group life insurance plans which provide equal insurance benefits, without sex differentiation either as to the benefits or as to the employees' contributions to the plans. Also, the National Association of Insurance Commissioners has urged the adoption of legislation and regulations to eliminate some forms of sex discrimination in insurance. Some States are attacking sex discrimination in an entire category of insurance. Thus, Hawaii, Massachusetts, Michigan, and North Carolina have adopted State laws forbidding sex discrimination in auto insurance, and in four other States—Florida, Louisiana, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania—the State insurance departments adopted regulations or orders to do the same, but were frustrated by the filing of court suits challenging their power to adopt such regulations unless specifically authorized by the State legislature. In addition, there have been many court decisions in suits brought by employee beneficiaries holding that sex discrimination in insurance and annuities, as to benefits as well as to employee contributions, violates title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and/or the Constitution.

The insurance industry's present widespread discrimination practices adversely affect millions of people in

our country. I believe that as more and more Members of Congress and the public study the issues and the effects of those practices, there will be increased recognition that there is urgent need to enact this legislation. This bill simply applies to insurance and annuities the same national nondiscrimination policy that the Congress has applied to virtually every other area of life. It leaves enforcement of that policy primarily to the States and only secondarily to the State and Federal courts, and it will not set up a Federal agency to administer the law. Its enactment will make unnecessary the extensive litigation which, under other statutes such as title VII and the Equal Pay Act, is now facing the insurance industry.

In short, H.R. 100 is a bill whose enactment will benefit millions of people, will not harm the insurance industry, and should be enacted.

I invite all Members to cosponsor this bill. I intend, after a reasonable time for responses, to ask that the bill be reprinted to list all cosponsors.●

THE NATION AND THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST BOTH NEED A NEW LOCK AT BONNEVILLE DAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, today I, along with my colleagues Mr. AuCoin, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. DICKS, Mr. BONKER, Mr. CRAIG, and Mr. DENNY SMITH of Oregon, am introducing legislation to authorize construction of a new navigation lock at Bonneville Dam on the Columbia River. The lock is estimated to cost \$167 million and will remove a bottleneck on the 465-mile Columbia-Snake waterway system that is frustrating increased barge traffic.

The project is necessary if the Columbia-Snake River system is to mature and realize its potential as one of the world's great waterway systems. When fully developed, the Columbia-Snake River system will be a tremendous national asset, aiding in the movement of cargo from the resource-rich Northwest and adding to our national security by providing a northern transportation route not dependent on passage through the Panama Canal.

As such, this is not a regional issue, but an issue of national importance.

The Columbia-Snake River system now moves 3.2 billion tons of waterborne commerce annually, valued at \$25 billion in revenue. Most of the tonnage is in bulk commodities, including grain, petroleum, sand and gravel, fertilizer and forest products. The Columbia-Snake River system feeds, among

others, the Port of Portland, the west coast's leading port in export tonnage. With an improved modern lock at Bonneville, the system can do even more duty.

These are the economic reasons for a new lock at the Bonneville Dam:

It will eliminate a costly and time-consuming bottleneck now occurring at the present lock at Bonneville Dam. This lock is at the end of a seven-lock river system. The Bonneville lock is the oldest and smallest of the seven locks on the Columbia-Snake River waterway system forcing barge traffic to break up into smaller tows to lock through the Bonneville Dam. This delay causes congestion and costs shippers \$2 million annually.

The lock was built in 1938 and has not had any rehabilitation work since 1963, even though it handles 25 percent of all U.S. wheat exports. Wheat exports favorably impact our balance of payments. Wheat exports are in increasing demand in Asian Pacific rim countries, who now account for 55 percent of all U.S. grain exports.

Cargo moving through the existing lock at Bonneville tripled between 1970 and 1980. A total of 9.1 million tons of cargo passed through Bonneville in 1981. The value of exports shipped from the Oregon Customs District in 1981 totaled \$3.882 billion. Forty percent of this figure—or \$1.6 billion—passed through the Bonneville lock.

Construction of a new lock must begin soon. The Corps of Engineers has pegged the capacity of the existing lock at 13 million tons per year and projects that that saturation level of traffic will be reached between 1988 and 1990.

Projections on increases in shipments of the Columbia-Snake system have consistently fallen short of the mark. When full-scale commercial navigation was extended to Lewiston, Idaho, in 1976, the Corps of Engineers estimated that 5.7 million tons of grain would move from Lewiston to the Pacific Ocean by the year 2000. That figure was surpassed in the first year of operation and, in 1981, 6.25 million tons of grain were shipped from Lewiston.

The completion of the new lock will save shippers \$2.50 per ton, favorably influencing the cost of commodities and other products consumed in this country and exported abroad.

The new lock will aid the movement of America's coal exports from the West.

The new lock will aid expanding containerized cargo movements through the Columbia-Snake River system which totaled 187,000 tons in 1980. The Columbia-Snake system was one of the first to ship containers on barges. These shipments will double by 1990.

The new lock will enhance the development of a multimodal transportation network and increase opportunities for Midwest and other overland shipments that use rail-barge and motor carrier-barge shipments on the Columbia-Snake River system. These overland-waterway multimodal shipments will give shippers alternative western route systems easing the flow of traffic on the Mississippi River system and traffic which now must travel through the Panama Canal.

Construction of the new lock will have a positive environmental impact on the Columbia River by reducing turbulence, high oxygen levels and other negative marine pollution caused by congestion of barges and tows waiting to lock through the dam.

Construction of a new lock will help in protecting the natural scenic beauty of the Columbia River Gorge by balancing the use of the various transportation alternatives.

The new lock will aid in the shipment of waterborne transit which uses half the energy necessary to do the same job by rail and is nine times more energy efficient than motor carriers doing the same job. This energy savings becomes more significant when one considers that 49 percent of the regional commodity traffic uses the Columbia River system.

Finally, this project has a positive cost-benefit ratio, one of the key criteria being used by this administration to assess public expenditures. This project will return a minimum of \$5 for every Federal dollar invested. This Federal investment will leverage an estimated \$500 million private investment, creating desperately needed new employment opportunities along the Columbia-Snake River waterway system.

H.R. —

A bill to modify the Bonneville lock and dam project to provide that the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to construct a new lock

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Bonneville lock and dam project, Oregon and Washington, authorized by the first section of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes", approved August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1028), is hereby modified to provide that the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to construct a new lock in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated February 10, 1981, at an estimated cost of \$167,000,000.●

WALTER POLOVCHAK RIGHT TO REMAIN IN THE UNITED STATES MUST BE PROTECTED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, Today I am introducing legislation to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act in order to provide that once a person has been granted asylum under the laws of the United States, he may not be involuntarily removed from this country by contrary laws or judicial decrees of any state.

Specifically, this important bill would clarify the status of Walter Polovchak, the 15-year old Ukrainian boy, who lives in the 11th Congressional District of Illinois which I am honored to represent, and who wishes to remain in the United States rather than return to the Soviet Union.

As my colleagues know, the Polovchaks had emigrated to our country from the Soviet Union with their three children in January 1980, but after 6 months in the United States, Walter's parents became dissatisfied with American life, and decided to return to the Soviet Union. Wanting to remain in this country, Walter, age 12 at the time, fled from his parents on July 19, 1980, and later was granted political asylum by the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service. His older sister, age 17, was traveling on her own visa, and was legally old enough to decide to remain in this country without any problem. Therefore, Walter and his sister remained in the United States when their parents returned to the Soviet Union with their younger brother, and Walter, a minor, was subsequently placed by an Illinois lower court in the custody of Ukrainian friends in this country.

At present, although Walter has been granted asylum, he is in the center of a legal battle in the State courts of Illinois to determine the question of parental custody. An Illinois State appellate court reversed the lower court's holding and awarded custody to Walter's parents who are now in the Soviet Union. This court held that since there was no evidence of gross neglect or abuse, there were no grounds for withdrawing the parents' custody, and the Federal grant of asylum constituted an unprecedented intrusion into the sanctity of the family. His case is now pending before the Illinois Supreme Court, and should this court uphold the appellate court's decision, presumably Walter's parents would be free to compel Walter's return to the Soviet Union.

Freedom-loving people throughout the world have expressed their support for Walter's right to remain in the United States, and it is our duty as Americans to do all in our power to see that Walter's rights are upheld. The legislation which I am introducing simply insures that Walter's right to remain in this country is protected, and I urge my colleagues to give their bipartisan support to this bill so that Walter will never again be forced to

live under the tyranny and oppression of the Communists.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I would like to include an article entitled, "Solzhenitsyn Family Pleads for Walter," written by Roger Simon, which appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times on December 9, 1982. It describes the horrors Walter will face if he is forced to return to the Soviet Union, and the joy he has experienced living in our country in freedom and human dignity.

The article follows:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Dec. 9, 1982]

SOLZHENITSYN FAMILY PLEADS FOR WALTER
(By Roger Simon)

The family of Nobel Prize winner Alexander Solzhenitsyn has written a letter saying Walter Polovchak will face "horror" if he is forced to return to the Soviet Union.

"We have four sons," the letter, obtained by the Sun-Times, states. "I can imagine what is going on in the soul of an adolescent who knows what awaits him on that side and who does not have the strength to prevent that horror."

"He will have a choice: be placed behind bars or 'repent' publicly and degrade himself—which is the equivalent of not physical but spiritual suicide."

Walter Polovchak, 15, came to America in 1980 and is now a permanent resident of this country. The American Civil Liberties Union, however, is suing to return him to his parents in the Soviet Union.

Solzhenitsyn was imprisoned in his native country for unnamed political crimes and then was banished to the labor camps of central Asia. He survived and was exiled from the Soviet Union in 1974. He now lives with his wife and children in Vermont.

He has firsthand knowledge of the fate of children in the Soviet prison system. In The Gulag Archipelago, the book for which he was arrested for treason in 1974, he wrote:

"In the semidarkness [of the prison camp], with a wordless rustling, from all sides juveniles crept up on us on all fours like big rats."

"They were still boys, some twelve-year-olds even, but the Criminal Code accepted them too. They jumped us from all sides and six pairs of hands stripped from us [our food]."

"And all of this took place in total silence, with only the sound of sinister sniffing."

The letter regarding Walter Polovchak is dated Dec. 3 and is signed by Solzhenitsyn's wife, Natalia. It was sent to Henry Mark Holzer, one of Walter's attorneys. It says:

"I never would have believed that adults living on our planet in the 20th century might seriously consider the possibility of returning the boy to the U.S.S.R. against his will."

"After all, this is not a puppy, not a kitten, this is a being possessing a soul—and it is precisely on his soul, on his free will, and not on his hands and feet that the enslaving government of the U.S.S.R. is laying claim."

Natalia goes on to say that she understands the position taken by the ACLU: "... it is easy to object that, in principle, a rational society should not support the rebellion of children against their parents."

And, she states, she considers "the family might well be the most important structure of society" and that "in our own family my husband and I try to bring up our children with complete respect toward their elders."

"But," she says, "all these considerations make sense only for those societies where the family is at least partially independent from the state."

"In the U.S.S.R., for many decades already the family is deprived of its rights just as much, if not more, as any individual citizen."

She argues, as Walter's lawyers have argued, that if Walter is forced to return to the Soviet Union, he will face punishment, possibly prison.

"He himself saw American life," she writes, "he himself preferred it to Soviet life—that is to say, if Walter were deported to the U.S.S.R., the authorities there would never allow him to mingle uncontrolled with other people and tell them of his experience—for he is a 'bearer of the enemy's ideology.'"

"He will have a choice: be placed behind bars or 'repent' publicly and degrade himself—which is the equivalent of not physical but spiritual suicide."

"Is it really possible that judges can be found in America who will send a child away to make such a choice?"

"I am convinced that America herself no less than the young Polovchak boy needs to make the correct decision."

The legal cases involving Walter are still pending. One is before the Illinois Supreme Court and another is before the U.S. District Court.

Like everyone else, Walter is waiting to find out his fate.

I spoke to him by phone Wednesday at his foster home, where his foster family was preparing for Christmas.

"We'll be having a party," he said, "There will be a tree and I'll be hanging a stocking. Then we'll be going to church."

Though upon first meeting, Walter appears to be like any boy, there is a deep, underlying seriousness to him.

He seems to savor each moment, to treasure it.

"In the Soviet Union it was dangerous to go to church on Christmas," he said. "The police were always there and they marked down who went in. Here, we can go and not be afraid."

This will be Walter's third Christmas in America. His third in freedom. His third in which he is allowed to observe a religious holiday without fear.

And he will celebrate this Christmas as if it were his last.

For he knows it may be. ●

CONGRESS CANNOT TAKE PASSIVE ROLE CONCERNING NUCLEAR ARMS CONTROL ISSUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on August 5, 1982, the House of Representatives undertook a historic debate on nuclear arms control and the direction of U.S. national security policy. The focus of that debate was House Joint Resolution 521, which I had the honor of sponsoring with 182 cosponsors.

House Joint Resolution 521 called for the negotiation of a mutual and verifiable freeze on and reduction in nuclear weapons. As my colleagues will

recall, the resolution failed House passage by only two votes.

Since that occasion, the American people have strongly reinforced the basic premise embodied in House Joint Resolution 521 that the nuclear arms race must stop and the threat of nuclear annihilation must be reduced. Millions of American voters expressed their views on the issue of a mutual and verifiable freeze. Eight out of nine States and the District of Columbia expressed strong support for such a concept in recent referendums.

With this clear mandate established, I am today introducing a joint resolution essentially the same as House Joint Resolution 521. Consistent with Congress essential oversight responsibilities, the resolution outlines six objectives which U.S. negotiators should pursue at the START negotiations in Geneva.

To review, these objectives include: Pursuing a complete halt to the nuclear arms race; deciding when and how to achieve a mutual and verifiable freeze on nuclear warheads, missiles, and delivery systems; giving special attention to destabilizing weapons whose deployment would make such a freeze more difficult to achieve; pursuing substantial, equitable, and verifiable reductions after a freeze has been negotiated; preserving present limitations and controls on current nuclear weapons and their delivery systems; and incorporating ongoing negotiations on land-based intermediate-range nuclear missiles into the START negotiations.

This package of objectives represents the most comprehensive and effective means of enhancing U.S. national security through mutual and verifiable arms controls. The objectives in this resolution are clearcut and complementary.

The pursuit of a mutual and verifiable freeze represents an effort to prevent the further development of nuclear weapons on both sides. Because essential equivalence between the United States and Soviet nuclear arsenals exists, and its existence has been acknowledged by the Reagan administration, the freeze enhances strategic stability.

Above all, let it be unmistakably clear that my resolution does not provide for a unilateral freeze. Nor will it preclude any defense program proposed by the administration. There will be no freeze if it is not mutual and verifiable. On the other hand, if immediately implemented, Soviet efforts to gain a unilateral advantage during the START process would be blocked and near-term Soviet advantages in some nuclear weapons programs would be blunted.

Another important objective of the resolution is its emphasis on limiting the development of destabilizing weap-

ons. These weapons which have the capability to destroy the other sides' strategic nuclear weapons are most dangerous since they are likely to be the main element of a first strike and encourage a "use it or lose it" attitude on both sides toward nuclear weapons. Efforts to prohibit or limit these systems is a high arms control priority.

A mutual and verifiable freeze is not an end in itself. Therefore, once a freeze has stopped the momentum of the arms race, substantial equitable, and verifiable reductions become possible and are in fact the logical next step. Nonetheless, the linkage between freeze and reductions is a crucial one. The contention of the Reagan administration that the United States must arm to disarm and build in order to reduce stands reason on its head.

Until a mutual and verifiable freeze and reductions in nuclear weapons can be achieved, it is essential that arms control accomplishments already established be maintained. Therefore, my resolution calls for preserving present limitations and controls on current nuclear weapons and nuclear delivery systems.

The final objective of the resolution calls for the incorporation of ongoing negotiations in Geneva on land-based intermediate-range nuclear forces (INF) into the START negotiations. There are several reasons why this approach is advisable.

First, the decision to begin INF negotiations was originally to have taken place in the SALT framework, which has now been reconstituted as START. Second, intermediate-range missiles are inextricably linked to strategic nuclear forces on both sides and incorporation of INF with START strengthens this linkage and in the process the political cohesiveness and unity of the NATO alliance. Third, since any progress at the INF discussions is generally acknowledged to be dependent on progress at START, incorporation promotes such progress.

Mr. Speaker, I anticipate that this comprehensive package of proposals and other similar congressional initiatives in the nuclear arms control field will be the subject of debate and discussion in coming weeks. As chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I intend to hold hearings on the administration's arms control policy and on various congressional arms control resolutions leading to a committee markup and consideration of these crucial issues on the House floor in the near future.

I hope that all Members will participate in this process. Congress cannot take a passive role concerning nuclear arms control issues. Since Congress will be asked to approve the eventual final product of START, we have a responsibility, in a bipartisan fashion, to contribute to the formulation and development of that final product. To

simply let the President do what he wishes on this issue is clearly an abdication of that responsibility.●

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. CONTE) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CONTE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CARNEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. KRAMER, for 60 minutes, on January 6.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado, for 30 minutes, on January 6.

Mr. GEKAS, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. CARNEY, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. HORTON, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. JEFFORDS, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. MICHEL, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BATES) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BROOKS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LEVITAS, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. RODINO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OBERSTAR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DINGELL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WYDEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ZABLOCKI, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CARNEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PURSELL in three instances.

Mr. SHUSTER.

Mr. CONABLE.

Mr. CARNEY.

Mr. MARLENEE.

Mr. KEMP.

Mr. BARTLETT.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio in three instances.

Mr. CORCORAN in two instances.

Mr. BROYHILL.

Mr. FORSYTHE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BATES) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BROOKS in two instances.

Mr. CORRADA.

Mr. MAZZOLI.

Mr. WEISS in 25 instances.

Mr. HUBBARD.

Mr. PRICE in six instances.

Mr. DINGELL in two instances.

Mr. BARNES.

Mr. DANIEL.

Mr. DONNELLY.

Mr. GUARINI.

Mr. ANDERSON in 10 instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in 10 instances.

Mr. ROSENTHAL in 10 instances.

Mrs. BOUQUARD in five instances.

Mr. HAMILTON in 10 instances.

Mr. BROWN of California in 10 instances.

Mr. ANNUNZIO in six instances.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee in 10 instances.

Mr. BONER of Tennessee in five instances.

Mr. STARK in four instances.

Mr. DOWNEY.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana.

Mrs. KENNELLY.

Mr. BOLAND.

Mr. SEIBERLING in 10 instances.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY, JANUARY 6, 1982

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 14, the House stands adjourned until 2 p.m. on Thursday, January 6, 1983, in memory of the late Honorable JACK SWIGERT of Colorado.

Thereupon (at 4 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Resolution 14, the House adjourned until Thursday, January 6, 1983, at 2 p.m.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 1. A bill to amend and extend certain Federal laws that establish housing and community and neighborhood development and preservation programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MINETA (for himself and Mr. GEPHARDT):

H.R. 2. A bill to require reauthorizations of budget authority for Government programs at least every 10 years, to provide for review of Government programs at least every 10 years, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Rules and Government Operations.

By Mr. RODINO (for himself and Mr. FISH:

H.R. 3. A bill to provide for the appointment of U.S. bankruptcy judges under article III of the Constitution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 4. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Policy Act of 1978 to restrain natural gas price increases by facilitating price responsiveness during periods when supplies exceed demand, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina:

H.R. 5. A bill to establish an ocean and coastal resources management and development fund from which coastal States shall receive block grants; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LOTT:

H.R. 6. A bill to repeal the withholding of tax from interest and dividends; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 7. A bill to make permanent certain of the authorizations of appropriations under the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1963; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H.R. 8. A bill to recognize the Cabinet status of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FUQUA (for himself and Mr. CHAPPELL):

H.R. 9. A bill to designate components of the National Wilderness Preservation System in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OBERSTAR:

H.R. 10. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, and Education and Labor.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 11. A bill to extend through fiscal year 1989 the authorization of appropriations for certain education programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LAFALCE:

H.R. 12. A bill to extend by 7 months the expiration date of the Defense Production Act of 1950; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. McKINNEY:

H.R. 13. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 to revitalize the defense industrial base of the United States; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, and Education and Labor.

By Mr. PERKINS (for himself and Mr. GOODLING):

H.R. 14. A bill to extend the authorization of appropriations under the Vocational Educational Act of 1963; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 15. A bill to amend the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982 to repeal the provisions requiring withholding on dividends and interest; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 16. A bill to provide a program of national health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa (for himself, Mr. GORE, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. FOGLETTA, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. HOYER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. QUILLLEN, Mr. ROBINO, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. SOLARZ, and Mr. CROCKETT):

H.R. 17. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require that certain foods intended for human consumption be labeled to show the amount of sodium and potassium they contain; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.R. 18. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engi-

neers, to carry out a waters resources development project on, and along, a certain segment of the Des Moines River, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa (for himself and Mr. UDALL):

H.R. 19. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to establish a program to insure the stockpiling and replacement of topsoil on public lands and other lands which are moved or covered by surface mining projects, reclamation projects, and other Federal and federally assisted projects, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 20. A bill to establish a Federal Oil and Gas Corporation; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Interior and Insular Affairs, and Science and Technology.

H.R. 21. A bill to promote competition in the production of coal, uranium, and geothermal power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JEFFORDS:

H.R. 22. A bill to assure the production of an adequate supply of pure and wholesome milk to meet the needs of markets in the United States, to assure a reasonable level of return to dairy farmers and stable prices for dairy products for consumers, to stabilize a temporary imbalance in the supply of and demand for dairy products, enable milk producers to establish, finance, and carry out a coordinated program of dairy product promotion to improve, maintain, and develop markets for dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 23. A bill to assure the production of an adequate supply of pure and wholesome milk to meet the needs of markets in the United States, to assure a reasonable level of return to dairy farmers and stable prices for dairy products for consumers, to stabilize a temporary imbalance in the supply of and demand for dairy products, enable milk producers to establish, finance, and carry out a coordinated program of dairy product promotion to improve, maintain, and develop markets for dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HORTON (for himself and Mr. LUNDINE):

H.R. 24. A bill to make certain land owned by the United States in the State of New York part of the Green Mountain National Forest; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 25. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to clarify the status of individuals who have been granted asylum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 26. A bill to amend title 5 of the United States Code to provide death benefits to survivors of Federal law enforcement officers and firefighters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 27. A bill to amend the Gun Control Act of 1968 to provide for separate offense and consecutive sentencing in felonies involving the use of a firearm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 28. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to require as a condition of assistance under such act that law enforcement agencies have in effect a binding law enforcement officers' bill of rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 29. A bill to recognize the organization known as the Polish Legion of Ameri-

can Veterans, U.S.A.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS (for himself, Mr. SIMON, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana, Mr. WEISS, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BEVILL, and Mr. BOUCHER):

H.R. 30. A bill to provide assistance to improve elementary, secondary, and postsecondary education in mathematics and science, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ASPIN (for himself, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. LUKE, Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR., Mr. ROE, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. LATTI, Mr. FROST, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. VENTO, Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana, Mr. D'AMOURS, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio, Mr. LOEFFLER, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. WYLLIE, Mr. FISH, Mr. SIMON, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. STOKES, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. RATCHFORD, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. WEAVER, and Mr. ROEMER):

H.R. 31. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to include chiropractic care in the health care that may be provided to members and certain former members of the uniformed services and their dependents and to authorize chiropractors to be appointed as commissioned officers in the Armed Forces to provide such chiropractic care; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 32. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to regulate the discharge of members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 33. A bill to transfer management of the national defense stockpile to the Secretary of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 34. A bill to protect the constitutional rights of persons subject to the military justice system, to revise the Uniform Code of Military Justice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 35. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to establish a new procurement system for the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 36. A bill to make eligible for annuities payable under section 4 of Public Law 92-425 (relating to the Armed Forces survivor benefit plan) persons who became widows during the 18-month period following the effective date of such law; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 37. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide that a reenlistment bonus paid to an enlisted member of the Armed Forces shall be paid in the highest applicable amount in effect during the 1-year period preceding the end of the member's current enlistment; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 38. A bill to make multipurpose senior centers available to handicapped or disabled individuals who have not attained 60 years of age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 39. A bill to provide for payment of certain insurance benefits to certain protected employees of the Consolidated Rail Corporation to insure that such employees were not disadvantaged between April 1 and September 30, 1976; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 40. A bill to amend the Arms Export Control Act (formerly Foreign Military Sales Act) to authorize the President to prescribe regulations for protecting arms information from the risk of indiscriminate export; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 41. A bill to insure that a country receiving foreign assistance cooperate with the Government of the United States in its efforts to reduce the flow of illicit drugs from such country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 42. A bill to establish a Commission on More Effective Government, with the declared objective of improving the quality of Government in the United States and of restoring public confidence in Government at all levels; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 43. A bill to establish a series of six regional Presidential primaries at which the public may express its preference for the nomination of an individual for election to the office of President of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 44. A bill to provide for disclosures by lobbyists, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 45. A bill to subject certain nationals or citizens of the United States to the jurisdiction of the U.S. district courts for their crimes committed outside the United States and to provide for the apprehension, restraint, removal, and delivery of such persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 46. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to limit the jurisdiction of courts established by Congress under articles III of the Constitution of the United States over State cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 47. A bill to modify the insanity defense in the Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 48. A bill to improve the administration of criminal justice with respect to organized crime and the use of violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 49. A bill to prohibit any act or threat of violence in a labor dispute and any conspiracy to accomplish such act or threat and to impose criminal and civil penalties therefor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 50. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to change the types of hearings which a magistrate may conduct, and to change the jurisdiction for the consideration of, and the standards for the granting of, writs of habeas corpus by Federal courts upon the application of persons in custody pursuant to judgments of State courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 51. A bill to amend chapter 313 of title 18 of the United States Code to improve the system dealing with mental defectives charged with offenses against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 52. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to require that the most currently produced population data obtained by the Census Bureau be used in determining benefits received by State and local governments under Federal programs; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 53. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to establish additional criminal penalties applicable to persons who pilot aircraft in connection with drug smuggling operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

H.R. 54. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to require regulations prohibiting air carriers from dispensing alcoholic beverages and tobacco without charge to passengers aboard air carrier aircraft; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

H.R. 55. A bill to insure equal consideration of nonstructural water resources projects and plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

H.R. 56. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to set aside an appropriate area within the Arlington National Cemetery for the burial of cremated remains; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 57. A bill to provide for a Veterans' Administration general medical and surgical hospital at Jacksonville, Fla., and to achieve cooperation with the University of Florida College of Medicine in its activities in Jacksonville; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana (for himself and Mr. DERRICK):

H.R. 58. A bill to establish as a part of the Rules of the House of Representatives and the Senate a procedure for the periodic congressional review of Federal programs and tax expenditures, and to improve legislative oversight of Federal activities and regulatory programs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 59. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the unified credit against the estate tax shall not be reduced by certain gifts made during 1976 which are includible in the gross estate of the decedent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 60. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose a minimum tax on corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 61. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to deny the benefits of the accelerated cost recovery system to any business which does not expand its employment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 62. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that no individual shall pay an income tax of less than 10 percent of his net income which exceeds \$30,000 for any taxable year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHULZE:

H.R. 63. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage individuals to invest in the stock of domestic corporations by allowing a 10-percent income tax credit for such investments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 64. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide a new educational assistance program for persons who enlist, reenlist, or otherwise enter into the Armed Forces after December 31, 1980, and to provide a career serviceperson's educational assistance program for members of the Armed Forces, and to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize an educational leave of absence for members of the Armed Forces; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 65. A bill to abolish the National Security Council, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committee on Armed Services and Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

H.R. 66. A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to establish by law proce-

dures for the classification and protection of sensitive information relating to the national security, to provide criminal penalties for unauthorized disclosure of such information, to limit matters that may be classified and impose penalties for unauthorized classification, to provide for declassification, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

H.R. 67. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services, Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, Government Operations, and Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 68. A bill to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Transportation to increase the term of service in the armed forces under their jurisdiction and to pay bonuses for enlistment and reenlistment in the Reserve components; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 69. A bill to provide that any abandoned historic shipwreck located, in whole or in part, on the Outer Continental Shelf or on lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of a State shall be the property of the United States (subject to transfer to that State after adoption of an adequate State plan), and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 70. A bill to tighten the conditions of release on bail for drug offenders; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BEREUTER (for himself, Mr. KAZEN, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, and Mr. KOGOVSEK):

H.R. 71. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to engage in a special study of the potential for ground water recharge in the High Plains States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 72. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to promote the matching of lists of defaulting borrowers of student loans with lists of public employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 73. A bill to provide for Federal support and encouragement of State, local, and community activities to prevent domestic violence and assist victims of domestic violence, to provide for coordination of Federal programs and activities relating to domestic violence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BIAGGI (for himself and Mr. FISH):

H.R. 74. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to authorize economic relief and rehabilitation assistance for Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 75. A bill to amend the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1982 to allow Federal law enforcement officers and firefighters who retired because of mandatory separation because of age to have cost-of-living adjustments in their retirement annuities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 76. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for maintaining a household a member of which is a dependent of the taxpayer who has attained age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 77. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit an exemption of the first \$5,000 of retirement income received by a taxpayer under a public retirement system or any other system if the taxpayer is at least 65 years of age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 78. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit certain cooperative housing corporations to replace conventional financing with tax-exempt financing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNEY (for himself and Mr. LENT):

H.R. 79. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to provide for the protection of certain recharge areas overlying sole source underground water supplies; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 80. A bill to amend title 39 of the United States Code to require that at least 10 per centum of expenditures by the Postal Service under certain contracts entered into by the Postal Service are expended for minority business enterprises, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 81. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to restore to Postal Service employees their rights to participate voluntarily, as private citizens, in the political processes of the Nation, to protect such employees from improper political solicitations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 82. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to restore to Federal civilian employees their rights to participate voluntarily, as private citizens, in the political processes of the Nation, to protect such employees from improper political solicitations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. COLLINS:

H.R. 83. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make unlawful the adulteration of food, drugs, and cosmetics carried out for the purpose of causing death or injury; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 84. A bill to establish temporary provision governing the day and times for the elections of Senators, Members of the House of Representatives, and electors of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. COLLINS:

H.R. 85. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of a national lottery to assist in financing the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, Post Office and Civil Service, and the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORCORAN:

H.R. 86. A bill to amend title 39 of the United States Code to terminate the Board of Governors of the United States Postal Service, to provide that the exercise of the power of the Postal Service shall be directed by the Postmaster General, to revise the authority of the Postal Rate Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 87. A bill to amend title 39 of the United States Code to provide for congressional review of proposed changes in postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CORRADA:

H.R. 88. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to limit the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make deductions

from proceeds of sale of milk marketed commercially by producers in certain insular areas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 89. A bill to permit the transportation of passengers between Puerto Rico and other U.S. ports on foreign-flag vessels when U.S.-flag service for such transportation is not available; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DICKINSON:

H.R. 90. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, concerning salary and pay of civilian air traffic controllers employed by the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DONNELLY:

H.R. 91. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage contributions of computer equipment to elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 92. A bill to amend chapter 67 of title 10, United States Code, to grant eligibility for retired pay to certain reservists who did not perform active duty before August 16, 1945, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 93. A bill to provide that social security benefit increases occurring after May 1981 shall not be considered as income or resources for the purposes of determining the eligibility for or amount of assistance which any individual or family is provided under certain Federal housing laws; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 94. A bill to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act to increase the maximum daily benefit from \$25 to \$40; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 95. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 to provide spouses' and widows' benefits to certain divorced persons; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 96. A bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 relating to the sale of electricity to industrial users by the Tennessee Valley Authority through States, counties, municipalities, and cooperative organizations; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

H.R. 97. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to limit benefits in the case of individuals who are not citizens or nationals of the United States or who are residing abroad; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 98. A bill to require the Internal Revenue Service to follow Frederick against the United States in the administration of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to transportation expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 99. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for contributions for the construction or maintenance of buildings housing fraternal organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 100. A bill to prohibit discrimination in insurance on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 101. A bill to strengthen the assignment program for durable medical equipment under title XVIII of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDGAR (by request):

H.R. 102. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to promote the care and treatment of veterans in State veterans' homes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 103. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the per diem rate payable by the Veterans' Administration to States providing domiciliary, nursing home, and hospital care to veterans in State homes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 104. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reduce from 50 percent to 30 percent the degree of service-connected disability a veteran must have in order to be eligible for non-service-connected outpatient care from the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 105. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the travel allowance paid by the Veterans' Administration for travel by a veteran in connection with a service-connected disability; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 106. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code to authorize the Veterans' Administration to administer a community residential care program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 107. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code to reduce from 100 percent to 50 percent the degree of service-connected dental care from the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California (for himself, Mr. HYDE, and Mr. MINETA):

H.R. 108. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to issue certificates of review applicable under the antitrust laws with respect to joint research and development programs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 109. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code in order to establish Optometry Corps in the Army and the Navy and to provide a separate optometric service within the Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 110. A bill to authorize recomputation at age 60 of the retired pay of members and former members of the uniformed services whose retired pay is computed on the basis of pay scales in effect prior to January 1, 1972, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 111. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to provide that where violations are corrected within the prescribed abatement period no penalty shall be assessed; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 112. A bill to amend the Federal Mine Safety and Health Amendments Act of 1977 to provide that the provisions of such act shall not apply to stone mining operations or to sand and gravel mining operations; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 113. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to provide penalties for persons who obtain or attempt to obtain narcotics or other controlled substances from a retail pharmacy by force and violence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 114. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit State and county extension services to obtain excess property from the United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 115. A bill to repeal the Gun Control Act of 1968, to reenact the Federal Firearms Act, to make the use of a firearm to commit certain felonies a Federal crime where that use violates State law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois:

H.R. 116. A bill to establish a program to provide funds to States for the purpose of job opportunities and business stimulation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 117. A bill to amend the Miller Act to authorize the payment of attorney fees and litigation cost to a prevailing plaintiff from performance bonds furnished by Federal contractors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 118. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to require the U.S. Postal Service to make certain considerations prior to closing of third- and fourth-class post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 119. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to make certain that recipients of veterans' pension and compensation will not have the amount of such pension or compensation reduced because of increases in monthly social security benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 120. A bill to repeal the withholding of tax from interest and dividends; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 121. A bill to provide coverage under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system for all officers and employees of the United States and its instrumentalities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 122. A bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to provide that supplemental security income benefits which are due an individual who dies without leaving an eligible spouse shall be paid to the person or persons who paid the expenses of such individual's last illness and burial; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 123. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to make basic modifications in the congressional budget process to improve its effectiveness so that it will better reflect the economic realities facing the Nation; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 124. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt nonprofit volunteer firefighting or rescue organizations from the Federal excise taxes on gasoline, diesel fuel, and certain other articles and services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 125. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 126. A bill to permit either House of Congress to disapprove certain rules proposed by executive agencies; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Rules.

H.R. 127. A bill to amend titles 14 and 38, United States Code, to provide veterans' benefits to temporary members of the U.S. Coast Guard Reserve, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 128. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to authorize payment under the supplementary medical in-

surance program for optometric and medical vision care; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FUQUA (for himself and Mr. HUTTO):

H.R. 129. A bill to permit extended dredging of bendways and interconnecting waterways; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

H.R. 130. A bill to permit the Corps of Engineers to acquire land for water-related public use; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. GRAMM:

H.R. 131. A bill to remove artificial impediments on the use of natural gas and to provide incentives for increased natural gas production; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GREGG (for himself, Mr. SHANNON, Mr. FRANK, Mr. MINISH, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. BEILEN-SON, Mr. FISH, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. MINETA, and Mr. WEBER):

H.R. 132. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to better protect against interstate transport of pollutants, to control existing and new sources of acid deposition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GREEN:

H.R. 133. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to enhance personal safety and reduce crime by providing for the registration of handguns, the licensing of handgun users, and a ban on the sale, manufacture, and importation of certain handguns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUARINI (for himself, Mr. RODINO, Mr. FORD of Michigan, and Mr. GARCIA):

H.R. 134. A bill to reestablish the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to authorize such Corporation to perform its traditional lending functions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. GUNDERSON (for himself, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. HORTON, Mr. KEMP, Mr. McDADE, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. PETRI, Mr. ROTH, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mrs. SNOWE):

H.R. 135. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to modify the dairy price support program for fiscal years 1983 through 1985; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR.:

H.R. 136. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture, under certain conditions to permit borrowers who are farmers to transfer, encumber, or lease property securing certain loans made under provisions of law administered by the Farmers Home Administration; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 137. A bill to abolish the Legal Services Corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.R. 138. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to mint and issue gold coins to be known as Jeffersons, Hamiltons, Madisons, and Franklins; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 139. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to provide that the Secretary of Labor may conduct inspections at the workplace of an employer only after the issuance of a search warrant; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 140. A bill to repeal the Occupational Safety and Health Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 141. A bill to repeal the Davis-Bacon Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 142. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to concentrate enforcement activities on hazardous workplaces, to exempt family farms from the act, to encourage self-initiative in improving occupational safety and health, to provide the procedures by which the Secretary of Labor may procure a search warrant for the purpose of conducting inspections at the workplace of an employer pursuant to the act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 143. A bill to amend the Contract Work Hours Standards Act to require overtime compensation only for hours of employment in excess of 40 hours in a workweek; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 144. A bill to amend the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 to provide that the provisions of such act shall not apply to surface sand or gravel mining operations, stone mining operations, clay mining operations, or certain surface construction projects; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 145. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to prohibit restrictions on work rules in locations in which there is hunting, fishing, or shooting sports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 146. A bill to exempt nonhazardous business from the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 147. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to exempt small businesses having no more than 10 full-time employees or the equivalent thereof, and does not have an occupational injury incidence rate exceeding 7 per 100 full-time employees based upon the annual Bureau of Labor Statistics survey or 3- and 4-digit Standard Industrial Classification Code industries; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 148. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 149. A bill entitled the "State Legislative and Administrative Procedure Protection Act of 1983"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 150. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to make certain modifications in provisions relating to automobile emissions control devices and fuel additives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 151. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to repeal the requirement that State implementation plans provide for periodic inspection and testing of motor vehicles; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 152. A bill to provide that a Federal agency may not require that any person maintain records for a period in excess of 4 years, and a Federal agency may not commence an action for enforcement of a law or regulation or for collection of a civil fine after 4 years from the date of the act which is the subject of the enforcement action or fine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 153. A bill to establish a Commission and Task Force to review all Federal Government programs, determine what econo-

mies and efficiencies can be achieved through program consolidation, review the functions carried out by each level of government, and make recommendations for more clearly defining the respective responsibilities of such levels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 154. A bill to require the Environmental Protection Agency and all other Federal regulatory agencies to evaluate, prior to the issuance of a regulation, the potential economic effect and environmental impact of such regulations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 155. A bill to provide for the cession and conveyance to the States of federally owned, unreserved, unappropriated lands, and to establish policy, methods, procedures, schedules, and criteria for such transfers; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 156. A bill to amend Public Law 94-400 to require that the Secretary of the Interior maintain the confidentiality of information gathered from victims of the Teton Dam disaster, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 157. A bill to remove statutory limitations upon the application of the Sherman Act to labor organizations and their activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 158. A bill to extinguish Federal court jurisdiction to require attendance at a particular school of any student because of race, color, creed, or sex; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 159. A bill to repeal the Gun Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 160. A bill to amend certain provisions of title 28, United States Code, relating to venue in the district courts and the courts of appeals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 161. A bill to provide that in civil actions where the United States is a plaintiff, a prevailing defendant may recover a reasonable attorney's fee and other reasonable litigation costs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 162. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide for special venue provisions in cases relating to the environment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 163. A bill to require that Federal agencies publish certain statements during the rulemaking process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 164. A bill providing that any State legislature which rescinds its ratification of a proposed amendment to the Constitution shall not be considered to have ratified the amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 165. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to \$24,000 in 1983 (with automatic adjustments thereafter) the amount of outside earnings which a beneficiary age 65 or over may have in any taxable year without suffering reductions in the amount of his benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 166. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 167. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the earnings test for individuals age 65 and over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 168. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt dividends from Federal taxation, to allocate corporate income tax revenues for payments to qualified registered voters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 169. A bill to repeal sections 301 through 308 of the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982, which impose withholding on interest and dividends; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 170. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide taxpayer relief and simplification of the individual income tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 171. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to regulate and limit collection procedures of the Internal Revenue Service in order to provide protection of taxpayer civil rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 172. A bill to amend title 5 of the United States Code to establish a uniform procedure for congressional review of agency rules which may be contrary to law or inconsistent with congressional intent, to expand opportunities for public participation in agency rulemaking, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Rules.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho (for himself, Mr. MARLENEE, and Mr. PASH-AYAN):

H.R. 173. A bill to establish fees for recreation residence on national forest system lands; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOYER:

H.R. 174. A bill entitled: the "Gladys Noon Spellman Parkway"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself and Mr. PARRIS):

H.R. 175. A bill to amend title 17 of the United States Code to exempt the private noncommercial recording of copyrighted works on video recorders from copyright infringement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HOLT:

H.R. 176. A bill to authorize recomputation at age 60 of the retired pay of members and former members of the uniformed services whose retired pay is computed on the basis of pay scales in effect prior to January 1, 1972, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 177. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to reduce the cost-sharing required of participants in the civilian health and medical program of the uniformed services (CHAMPUS) for inpatient medical care provided on an emergency basis; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 178. A bill to repeal the Davis-Bacon Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 179. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 to provide emphasis within the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism for families of alcohol abusers and alcoholics; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 180. A bill to provide a remedy for sex discrimination by the insurance business with respect to the availability and scope of insurance coverage for women; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 181. A bill to provide for the inclusion of certain Federal entities in the

budget totals, effective with the 1987 budget; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 182. A bill to provide for payments in lieu of real property taxes with respect to certain real property owned by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 183. A bill to limit the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States and of the district courts to enter any judgment, decree, or order, denying or restricting, as unconstitutional, voluntary prayer in any public school; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 184. A bill to change from level IV to level III of the executive schedule the position of Special Representative for Arms Control and Disarmament Negotiations of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 185. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to allow certain employees of the National Transportation Safety Board to receive civil service retirement credit for their service under the Federal railroad retirement program; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 186. A bill to improve the congressional budget process by the establishment in the House of Representatives of a two-step budget procedure for the consideration of a first required concurrent resolution on the budget; to the Committee on Rules.

H.R. 187. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to establish in the Congress a zero-base budgeting process, with full congressional review of each Federal program at least once every 6 years; to the Committee on Rules.

H.R. 188. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for expenses paid by him for the education of any of his dependents at an institution of higher learning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 189. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction to individuals who rent their principal residences for a portion of the real property taxes paid or accrued by their landlords; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 190. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an exemption for certain professional liability insurance organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 191. A bill to exempt certain charterboats in the U.S. Virgin Islands from the entry requirements of the customs laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 192. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the benefit reductions which are presently required in the case of spouses and surviving spouses who are also receiving certain Government pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 193. A bill to repeal section 3402(q) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which requires for income tax purposes, amounts to be withheld from certain gambling winnings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUGHES:

H.R. 194. A bill to repeal the withholding on interest, dividends, and patronage dividends enacted by the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 195. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the exclusion from gross income of a certain portion of amounts received as annuities, pensions, or other retirement benefits by individuals who have attained age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOGOVSEK (for himself, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. ROE, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana, Mr. APPELATE, and Mr. MAVROULES):

H.R. 196. A bill to repeal the withholding of tax from interest and dividends; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LENT:

H.R. 197. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18 of the United States Code (respecting firearms) to penalize the use of firearms in the commission of any felony and to increase the penalties in certain related existing provisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 198. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide generally that benefits thereunder may be paid to aliens only after they have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, and to impose further restrictions on the right of any alien in a foreign country to receive such benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 199. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 200. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a Federal income tax credit for tuition; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 201. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow certain low- and middle-income individuals a refundable tax credit for a certain portion of the property taxes paid by them on their principal residences or of the rent they pay for their principal residences; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 202. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide individuals a limited exclusion from gross income for interest on deposits in certain savings institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 203. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to improve the treatment of women through the establishment and payment of working spouse's benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 204. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a basic \$10,000 exemption from income tax, in the case of an individual or married couple, for amounts received as annuities, pensions, or other retirement benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 205. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide penalties for the misuse of social security numbers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 206. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for a program to systematically compare information on State death certificates with information maintained under the social security program in order to insure that inappropriate benefits are not paid with respect to individuals who have died; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 207. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the

medical expenses of handicapped individuals and individuals who have attained age 65 shall be deductible without regard to the requirement that only medical expenses in excess of certain percentages of adjusted gross income are deductible; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 208. A bill to establish a task force to study and evaluate the taxation of real property by State and local governments, the effects of such taxation on certain taxpayers, and the feasibility of Federal taxation and other policies designed to reduce the dependence of State and local governments on such taxation; jointly to the Committees on Government Operations and Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 209. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to arrange for an independent epidemiological study of persons exposed to the chemical dioxin, used in the herbicide known as agent orange; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 210. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide that telephone receivers may not be sold in interstate commerce unless they are manufactured in a manner which permits their use by persons with hearing impairments; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 211. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to restore certain social security benefits repealed by Public Law 97-35 in the case of survivors of veterans dying of service-connected disabilities incurred before September 1, 1981; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 212. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to waive the 1-year limitation on claims for compensation from the Veterans' Administration for disabilities and diseases incurred in or aggravated by military service in the case of claims by veterans who served in Southeast Asia during the Vietnam era for compensation for disabilities resulting from exposure to the phenoxy herbicide known as agent orange or other phenoxy herbicides; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 213. A bill to amend chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code, to modify the termination date for veterans eligible for educational assistance provided under such chapter; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 214. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reaffirm the fact that benefits payable thereunder are exempt from all taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 215. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide individuals a limited exclusion from gross income for interest on deposits in certain savings institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 216. A bill to amend part D of title IV of the Social Security Act to provide that the procedures which are presently available to AFDC families for the collection of past-due child and spousal support from Federal tax refunds shall also be available to non-AFDC families; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCOLLUM:

H.R. 217. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code with respect to interests in time-share premises; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MIKULSKI:

H.R. 218. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to provide certain rules with

respect to the treatment of used oil as hazardous waste unless the used oil is recycled under appropriate standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 219. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to double the investment tax credit for American-made automobiles and certain light-duty trucks and to provide that the investment tax credit shall not be recaptured with respect to such vehicles by reason of any disposition, et cetera, after the second year of use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEVITAS (for himself, and Mr. SAM B. HALL, Jr., and Mr. KINDNESS):

H.R. 220. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to make regulations more cost effective, to insure review of rules, to improve regulatory planning and management, to enhance public participation in the regulatory process, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Rules.

By Mr. MARLENEE (for himself, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. FRANK, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DENNY, Mr. SMITH, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. PETRI, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. McCURDY, Mrs. HALL of Indiana, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. MORRISON, of Washington):

H.R. 221. A bill to repeal the withholding of tax from interest and dividends; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois:

H.R. 222. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a program to offset agricultural export subsidies imposed by foreign countries by subsidizing the exportation of agricultural commodities produced in the United States and products of such commodities; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Ohio:

H.R. 223. A bill to eliminate the recent pay increase provided for Members of Congress under Public Law 97-377, and to impose a limitation on outside earnings for Senators and Representatives; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RODINO (for himself, Mr. FISH, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. UDALL, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. MATSUI, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. STARK, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MINETA, Mr. COELHO, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. FIEDLER, Mr. BEILEN-SON, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. TORRES, Mr. DIXON, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. PATTERSON, Mr. BATES, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. GEJDESON, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. RATCHFORD, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MACKAY, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. FOWLER, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. YATES, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. SIMON, Mrs. HALL of Indiana, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. SHARP, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. EVANS of

Iowa, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. HOYER, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. BARNES, Mr. CONTE, Mr. EARLY, Mr. FRANK, Mr. SHANNON, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. CARR, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. ALBOSTA, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. PENNY, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. VENTO, Mr. SABO, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana, Mr. GREGG, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. ROE, Mr. MINISH, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ADDABBO, Ms. FERRARO, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WEISS, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. HORTON, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. PEASE, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. REGULA, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. STOKES, Mr. ECKART, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. McCURDY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. GRAY, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. HARRISON, Mr. COYNE, Mr. WALGREN, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. LELAND, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. VANDERGRIF, Mr. OLIN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. BONKER, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. DICKS, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. STAGERS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. WISE, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. MOODY, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. YATRON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. BEDELL, Mrs. SNOWE, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. DYSON, Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. FROST, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. LUKE, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. COURTER, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. OBEY, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. AU COIN, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. ROSENTHAL, and Mr. SLATTERY).

H.J. Res. 1. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. CONTE, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. BONKER, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. BARNES, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. ECKART, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. EDGAR, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. YATES, Mr. FOWLER, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. FLORIO,

Mr. WEAVER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. LELAND, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. DIXON, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. GRAY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SHANNON, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. SIMON, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. SABO, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. AU COIN, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. RODINO, Mr. WEISS, Mr. STARK, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. DELLUMS, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. RATCHFORD, Mr. COELHO, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. FRANK, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. HOYER, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. PATTERSON, Mr. EARLY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BEILENSEN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. PEPPER, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. PEASE, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. DICKS, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. ALBOSTA, Ms. FERRARO, Mrs. HALL of Indiana, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. HARRISON, Mr. TORRES, Mr. WISE, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CARR, Mr. BATES, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. JONES of Oklahoma, Mr. COYNE, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. MINISH, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. JACOBS).

H.J. Res. 2. Joint resolution calling for a mutual and verifiable freeze on and reductions in nuclear weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BEDELL (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. SIMON, Mr. BEILENSEN, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. GRAY, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. WEISS, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. MINETA, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. GORE, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. MITCHELL, Ms. FERRARO, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. VENTO, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. FRANK, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. STOKES, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. RODINO, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. BARNES, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. LELAND, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. SABO, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. DIXON, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. RATCHFORD, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. FORSYTHE, and Mr. HAMILTON).

H.J. Res. 3. Joint resolution to prevent nuclear testing; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD (for himself, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. STRATTON, and Mr. PRICE):

H.J. Res. 4. Joint resolution calling for mutual and verifiable reductions in nuclear arsenals and expressing the full support of the Congress for the two on-going arms reduction negotiations in Geneva between the United States and the U.S.S.R. These negotiations are directed toward achieving substantial, verifiable, equitable and militarily significant reductions in the nuclear arsenals of the world's two superpowers, thereby reducing the dangers of nuclear war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H.J. Res. 5. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for the direct popular election of the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 6. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for single 6-year terms for the President and Vice President, and to repeal the 22d article of amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.J. Res. 7. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.J. Res. 8. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide that, except in time of war or economic emergency declared by the Congress, expenditures of the Government may not exceed the revenues of the Government during any fiscal year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 9. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prohibit compelling attendance in schools other than the one nearest the residence and to insure equal educational opportunities for all students wherever located; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 10. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States allowing an item veto in appropriations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 11. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for the direct election of the President and the Vice President and to authorize Congress to establish procedures relating to the nomination of Presidential and Vice-Presidential candidates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LENT:

H.J. Res. 12. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that appropriations made by the United States shall not exceed its revenues, except in time of war or national emergency; and to provide for the systematic paying back of the national debt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.J. Res. 13. Joint resolution calling for a mutual and verifiable freeze on and reductions in nuclear weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EMERSON:

H.J. Res. 14. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prohibit compelling the attendance of a student in a public school

other than the public school nearest the residence of such student; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 15. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the right of life; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.J. Res. 16. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 17. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for a procedure for removal from office, in every 10th year of service of the judges of the Supreme Court and inferior Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 18. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to establish a new procedure for the election of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 19. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that appropriations made by the United States shall not exceed its revenues, except in time of war or national emergency; and to provide for the systematic paying back of the national debt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 20. Joint resolution designating November 13, 1983, as "National Retired Teachers Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HILER:

H.J. Res. 21. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the week beginning on June 19, 1983, as "A Rose for Friendship Week" and to provide for the designation of June 22, 1983, as "A Rose for Friendship Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.J. Res. 22. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the month of April 1983, as "National Child Abuse Prevention Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. McDONALD):

H.J. Res. 23. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to abolishing personal income, estate, and gift taxes and prohibiting the U.S. Government from engaging in business in competition with its citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By HANSEN of Idaho:

H.J. Res. 24. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that appropriations made by the United States shall not exceed its revenues, except in time of war or national emergency; and to provide for the systematic paying back of the national debt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 25. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States allowing the District of Columbia and the territories and possessions of the United States to have Representatives in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 26. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States for the protection of unborn children and other persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 27. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the level of total outlays of the United States for any

fiscal year shall not exceed the level of total receipts of the United States for such fiscal year and for the disposition of unanticipated deficits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 28. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States under which the courts of the United States may not assign any person to any school on the basis of race, religion, or national origin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 29. Joint resolution to designate the week of June 26, 1983, through July 2, 1983, as "National Safety in the Workplace Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.J. Res. 30. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the President to provide for the playing of taps at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, Washington, District of Columbia; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.J. Res. 31. Joint resolution designating September 14 of each year as "Francis Scott Key Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McCOLLUM (for himself, Mr. DAUB, Mr. WALKER, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE, Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. GREGG, Mr. WOLF, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. HANSEN of Utah, Mr. HILER, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.J. Res. 32. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the number of terms of office of Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCOLLUM (for himself, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, Mr. HANSEN of Utah, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. MICA, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. WINN, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.J. Res. 33. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for 4-year terms for Representatives and to limit the number of terms Senators and Representatives may serve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEAL:

H.J. Res. 34. Joint resolution calling for a mutual and verifiable freeze on and reductions in nuclear weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.J. Res. 35. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that, except in cases of national emergency, expenditures of the U.S. Government in any fiscal year shall not exceed its revenues for the fiscal year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 36. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that, except in cases of war or other grave national emergency as determined by the Congress, expenditures of the United States in each fiscal year shall not exceed 20 per centum of the gross national product for the preceding calendar year, and expenditures of the United States in each fiscal year shall not exceed revenues of the United States for that fiscal year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 37. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 38. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUILLLEN:

H.J. Res. 39. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that appropriations made by the United States shall not exceed its revenues, except in time of war or threat of war as determined by the Congress; and to provide for the systematic paying back of the national debt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBINSON:

H.J. Res. 40. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that appropriations made by the United States shall not exceed its revenues, except in time of war or national emergency; and to provide for the systematic paying back of the national debt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROE:

H.J. Res. 41. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the 42d anniversary of the renewal of Ukrainian independence, June 30, 1983, as "Ukrainian Independence Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.J. Res. 42. Joint resolution to designate April 24, 1983, as "National Day of Remembrance of Man's Inhumanity to Man"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.J. Res. 43. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in honor of Patience Lovell Wright; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.J. Res. 44. Joint resolution designating May 1 through May 7, 1983, as "Days of Remembrance of Victims of the Holocaust"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROTH:

H.J. Res. 45. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for staggered 4-year terms for the Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHUMWAY:

H.J. Res. 46. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for staggered 4-year terms for Representatives, for a limitation on the number of terms a person may serve in the House of Representatives or the Senate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 47. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that appropriations made by the United States shall not exceed its revenues, except in time of war or national emergency; and to provide for the systematic paying back of the national debt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.J. Res. 48. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the nomination of individuals for election to the offices of the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT:

H.J. Res. 49. Joint resolution designating the week of November 7 through November 13, 1983, as "National Reye's Syndrome

Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WEISS:

H.J. Res. 50. Joint resolution to renounce the first use of all nuclear weapons and to conclude treaties with all nations renouncing the first use of all nuclear weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H.J. Res. 51. Joint resolution to designate December 11, 1983, as "National Military Families Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H. Con. Res. 1. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President on the state of the Union; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H. Con. Res. 2. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress relating to films and broadcasts which defame, stereotype, ridicule, demean, or degrade ethnic, racial, and religious groups; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H. Con. Res. 3. Concurrent resolution to collect overdue debts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H. Con. Res. 4. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the U.S. Postal Service should not reduce the frequency of mail delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. HOLT:

H. Con. Res. 5. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of Congress regarding periods of silence in the public schools; Jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Education and Labor.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H. Con. Res. 6. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the States should enact statutes encouraging the courts to consider joint custody of minor children in marital divorce settlements before all other alternatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Secretary of the Army should place a plaque in Arlington National Cemetery honoring members of the U.S. Armed Forces who died during an attempt to rescue American hostages held in Iran; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 8. Concurrent resolution urging the President to provide as expeditiously as possible for the burial of an unknown soldier from the Vietnam era at Arlington National Cemetery as directed by the National Cemeteries Act of 1973; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution directing the Commissioner of Social Security and the Secretary of Health and Human Services to immediately develop and present to the Congress a plan to correct the social security benefit disparity which has become known as the notch problem; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. Con. Res. 10. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the age of retirement under the social security program should remain at 65, and that the Congress will not enact legislation to raise such age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. Con. Res. 11. Concurrent resolution stating the intent of the Congress that social security benefits payable to prison inmates be surrendered to defray the current

costs to the taxpayer of supporting prisoners in penal institutions as well as supporting their dependents on public assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEAL:

H. Con. Res. 12. Concurrent Resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States should seek to negotiate an agreement with the Government of Japan, whereby that nation would pay an annual security tax to the U.S. Government equal to 2 percent of Japan's annual gross national product, to more equitably compensate the United States for expenditures related to carrying out the provisions of the United States/Japanese Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security, and for the security of the free world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 13. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of Congress regarding periods of silence in the public schools; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and the Judiciary.

H. Con. Res. 14. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of Congress regarding periods of silence in the public schools; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROE:

H. Con. Res. 15. Concurrent resolution urging a moratorium on the commercial killing of whales; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 16. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, and that the U.S. Embassy in Israel should be relocated to Jerusalem; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 17. Concurrent resolution concerning the rights of the people of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the strategic importance of Israel to the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. Con. Res. 19. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Secretary of Health and Human Services should withdraw a proposed reduction in public notice and comment opportunities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H. Res. 1. Resolution electing officers of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

H. Res. 2. Resolution informing the Senate that a quorum of the House has assembled and has elected Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., a Representative from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Speaker; and Benjamin J. Guthrie, a citizen of the Commonwealth of Virginia, Clerk; considered and agreed to.

H. Res. 3. Resolution authorizing the Speaker to appoint a committee of three Members on the part of the House to join with a like committee of the Senate to notify the President that a quorum of each House has been assembled and that Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. Res. 4. Resolution authorizing the Clerk of the House to inform the President that the House of Representatives has elected Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., a Representative from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Speaker; and Benjamin J. Guthrie, a citizen of the Commonwealth of Virginia, Clerk; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H. Res. 5. Resolution adopting the Rules of the House of Representatives for the 98th Congress; considered and agreed to.

H. Res. 6. Resolution relating to the compensation of the Postmaster of the House of Representatives shall be at a gross per annum rate which is equal to the gross per annum rate of compensation as the other officers of the House; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H. Res. 7. Resolution relating to the compensation of certain minority employees; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H. Res. 8. Resolution fixing the daily hour of meeting of the House; considered and agreed to.

H. Res. 9. Resolution authorizing the Speaker to administer the oath of office to the Honorable Benjamin S. Rosenthal in Washington, D.C.; considered and agreed to.

H. Res. 10. Resolution authorizing the Speaker to administer the oath of office to the Honorable Marty Russo in Minneapolis, Minn.; considered and agreed to.

H. Res. 11. Resolution authorizing the Speaker to administer the oath of office to the Honorable Mickey Edwards at Los Angeles, Calif.; considered and agreed to.

H. Res. 12. Resolution authorizing continuation of an investigation by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H. Res. 13. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for continuance of necessary investigations and studies by standing and select committees of the House through March 31, 1983; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. KRAMER:

H. Res. 14. Resolution that the House adjourn as a mark of respect to the memory of the Honorable Jack Swigert, Representative-elect from the State of Colorado; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself and Mr. LELAND):

H. Res. 15. Resolution to establish the Select Committee on Hunger; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. Res. 16. Resolution to establish the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DIXON (for himself, Mr. FOWLER, Mr. SIMON, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. GRAY, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SAVAGE, and Mr. STOKES):

H. Res. 17. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should award Benjamin Elijah Mays the Presidential Medal of Freedom in honor of his distinguished career as an educator, civil rights leader, and theologian; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H. Res. 18. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to establish the Committee on Internal Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROE:

H. Res. 19. Resolution designating May 3 as "Polish Constitution Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. Res. 20. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that negotiations pursuant to the 1979 NATO de-

cision concerning the deployment of nuclear weapons in Europe should be vigorously pursued by the United States and that the United States should commit itself to a clearly defined timetable for completion of such negotiations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 21. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that extended voluntary departure status should be granted to El Salvadorans in the United States whose safety would be endangered if they were required to return to El Salvador; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. Res. 22. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to require that all bills and resolutions have titles which accurately reflect their contents and all subject matters contained therein; to the Committee on Rules.